V. I. LENIN

THE ISKRA PERIOD

VOLUME IV

COLLECTED WORKS

OF

V. I. LENIN

Completely revised, edited and annotated.
The only edition authorized by the
V. I. Lenin Institute, Moscow

LENIN

VOLUME IV

THE ISKRA PERIOD

1900-1902

BOOK II

NEW YORK

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

Copyright, 1929, by
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.

Printed in the U. S. A.

This book is composed and printed by union labor.

Translated by

J. Fineberg

Edited by

Alexander Trachtenberg

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFATORY NOTE	9
ARTICLES FROM THE *Iskra* AND THE *Zarya*, 1901–1902	11-87
Review of Internal Affairs	13-57
I. Famine	13
II. Attitude Towards the Crisis and the Famine	32
III. The Third Element	39
IV. Two Speeches by Marshals of the Nobility	46
Preface to the Pamphlet, *Documents of the "Unity" Congress*	58
The Protest of the Finnish People	61
A Conversation with Defenders of Economism	65
The Demonstrations Have Commenced	72
The Budget	76
Political Agitation and "The Class Point-of-View"	82
WHAT IS TO BE DONE? Burning Questions of Our Movement	89-258
Preface	91
I. Dogmatism and "Freedom of Criticisim"	94
A. What Is "Freedom of Criticism"?	94
B. The New Advocates of "Freedom of Criticism"	97
C. Criticism in Russia	102
D. Engels on the Importance of the Theoretical Struggle	108
II. The Spontaneity of the Masses and the Class-Consciousness of Social-Democracy	113
A. The Beginning of the Spontaneous Movement	113
B. Bowing to Spontaneity. *Rabochaya Mysl*	117
C. The Self-Emancipation Group and *Rabocheye Dyelo*	126
III. Trade-Union Politics and Social-Democratic Politics	136
A. Political Agitation and its Restriction by the Economists	136
B. A Tale of How Martynov Rendered Plekhanov More Profound	146

PAGE

C. Political Exposures and "Training in Revolutionary Activity" 149
D. What is There in Common Between Economism and Terrorism? 154
E. The Working Class as Champion of Democracy 157
F. Again "Slanderers," Again "Mystifiers" . . 172

IV. The Primitiveness of the Economists and the Organisation of Revolutionists 176

A. What are Primitive Methods? 177
B. Primitive Methods and Economism 180
C. Organisation of Workers, and Organisation of Revolutionists 187
D. The Scope of Organisational Work 201
E. "Conspirative" Organisation and "Democracy" 207
F. Local and All-Russian Work 215

V. The "Plan" for an All-Russian Political Newspaper 225

A. Who was Offended by the Article "Where to Begin"? 225
B. Can a Newspaper be a Collective Organiser? . 230
C. What Type of Organisation do we Require? . 241

Conclusion 248

Appendix 251

Correction to *What Is To Be Done?* 258

APPENDICES 259-317

Explanatory Notes 261
Biographical Notes 279
Bibliography 309
Calendar of Events: From January, 1900, to January, 1902 311
Events in the Life of V. I. Lenin: From January, 1900, to January, 1902 315

ILLUSTRATION

Facsimile of Cover of First Edition of *What Is To Be Done?* 88

PREFATORY NOTE

THIS book completes the writings of V. I. Lenin relating to the period between the spring of 1900 and the beginning of 1902. The material in Book I extends to the autumn of 1901; the present book includes the rest of Lenin's writings up to January, 1902. The largest single writing in this book is the brochure *What Is To Be Done?* It may be considered as the synthesis of Lenin's basic ideas regarding the policies and tactics of the revolutionary movement contained in his previous writings.

Aside from the explanatory notes which refer exclusively to the text of this book, although they continue the numeration of the notes in Book I, the appendices at the end of the book are for the volume as a whole. The book and page numbers at the end of the biographical notes are intended as an index to the names mentioned in both books. Otherwise, the technical problems in connection with the entire volume have been considered in the general preface published in Book I.

October, 1929.

ARTICLES FROM THE *ISKRA* AND THE *ZARYA*

1901–1902

FAMINE

AGAIN famine! Not only the ruin of the peasantry has been taking place in the last ten years, but their positive extinction, and this with astonishing rapidity. Even war, no matter how prolonged and bitter, would not inflict such heavy sacrifice. The most powerful forces of modern times have combined against the muzhik: World capitalism—which is developing with increasing rapidity, creating foreign competition, and providing a small minority of farmers who are able to hold out in the desperate struggle for existence with the most improved implements of production; and the militarist government, whose policy of adventure in its colonial possessions in the Far East and Central Asia is entailing enormous cost, the burden of which is being imposed upon the shoulders of the masses of the workers, and which at the same time is training, at the people's expense, a fresh battery of "prohibitions" and "restraints" against the growing discontent and indignation of these masses.

Since famine has become an habitual phenomenon in our country, it would be natural to expect that the government would try to entrench itself in the policy it has been conducting in regard to the distribution of food. While in 1891-1892 the government was caught unawares, and was at first thrown into consternation, now, however, it is rich in experience and knows quite well where to go (and how to get there). In our July issue (No. 6) of *Iskra* we wrote:

> At this moment a black cloud of misfortune is hovering over the country, and the government is once again preparing to play the despicable and heartless rôle of taking the bread from the starving people, and of punishing every one who in the opinion of the officials has no "authority" to render aid to the starving.[115]

The government set to work very rapidly and determinedly to make its preparations. The spirit in which these preparations were made is illustrated by the Elizavetgrad affair. Prince Obolensky, the governor of the Kherson province, immediately declared war

against all who dared to write or speak about the famine in Elizavetgrad, appeal for publc aid for the famine-stricken, organise private circles and invite private persons to organise this aid. The Zemstvo doctors wrote to the newspapers stating that famine raged in the county, that the people were disease-stricken and dying, and that the "bread" they were eating was positively beyond belief, and could not be called bread at all. The provincial governor enters into a controversy with these doctors, and officially denies that there is famine. Any one at all acquainted with the conditions under which our press has to work, any one who will take the trouble to recall the severe persecution to which even moderate organs and incomparably more moderate authors have been subjected to recently, will understand the significance of this "controversy" between the provincial governor and mere Zemstvo doctors, who are not even in the government service! It was simply a gag, an obvious and unceremonious declaration that the government will not tolerate the truth being told about the famine. But what is a mere declaration? Whatever may be said about others, the Russian government cannot be reproached with restricting itself to mere declarations when the opportunities exist to "make a display of authority." And Prince Obolensky hastened to make a display of authority, personally appeared at the scene of war—war against the famine-stricken and against those who, though not on the payroll of any department, desire to render *real* aid to the famine-stricken, and *prohibited* a number of private persons (including Madame Uspenskaya), who had come into the famine-stricken area, *from opening food kitchens.* Like Julius Cæsar, Prince Obolensky came, saw and conquered. And the telegraph immediately informed all the reading public in Russia of this victory. One thing, at least, is astonishing, and that is that this victory, this brazen challenge to all Russians who have retained at least a shred of decency, at least a grain of civic courage, met with no resistance whatever on the part of those who, one may say, were most interested in this matter. Very many persons in the Kherson province no doubt knew, and know now, what is behind this silence about the famine, and the fight against famine relief, but no one has published a single statement on this instructive case, or the documents referring to it, or even a simple appeal to protest against the monstrous order prohibiting the setting up of food kitchens.

When the government carried out its threat to dismiss all those who "lost time" on May 1, the workers declared a strike. But the intelligent public remains dumb when its representatives are prohibited . . . from rendering aid to the famine-stricken.

As if encouraged by the success of this first skirmish with the "sowers of sedition" who dare to aid the famine-stricken, the government soon commenced the attack along the whole line. Prince Obolensky's brave exploit is elevated to a guiding principle, into a law, which from now on, is to regulate the relations between all administrators and all persons accessary to the distribution of food (the word "accessary," really speaking, is a term in criminal law peculiar to our Penal Code. But as we have already seen and shall see again later, at the present time to render aid to the famine-stricken without authority is regarded as a crime). And the Minister of the Interior hastened to follow up this law with "a circular of the Minister of the Interior addressed to all governors of provinces affected by the failure of the harvest of 1901" (August 17, 1901, No. 20).

It may be assumed that this circular will serve for many years to come as a souvenir of the monumental heights to which the fear of the police rises in the face of a national calamity, in their fear of the establishment of closer ties between the famine-stricken and the "intellectuals" who desire to help them, while revealing a firm intention to suppress all "noise" about the famine, and to restrict the relief to the most insignificant dimensions. It is a great pity that the immoderate length of this circular and the heaviness of the official style in which it is written will prevent the public at large from becoming acquainted with its contents.

It is known that by the law of June 12, 1900, the management of food affairs was taken out of the hands of the Zemstvos and transferred to the Zemstvo chiefs and county assemblies. One cannot imagine anything more reliable. The elective principle is eliminated; persons in the least independent of the officials will not be allowed to manage these affairs, and consequently will make no more noise. But after Prince Obolensky's crusade, all this appeared to be inadequate. The whole business must be more strictly subordinated to the Ministry of the Interior and to the officials directly carrying out its order; the slightest possibility of exaggeration must be utterly removed. For that reason, the question as to which coun-

ties are "affected by the failure of the harvest" from now on *is to be decided* only by the Ministry of the Interior * where apparently a general staff is to be set up to conduct military operations against the famine-stricken. And through the medium of the provincial governors, this general staff will direct the activities of those persons (principally the county marshals of the nobility) in whose hands the Central County Administration of Food Affairs is concentrated. The initiator of military operations against the famine-stricken, Prince Obolensky, was obliged to travel personally to the district in order to prohibit, restrain and curtail. Now, all this is "regulated," and all that is necessary is an exchange of telegrams (to be paid for out of the special grant of a thousand rubles per county for office expenses) between the County Central and the St. Petersburg Central Administrations for the necessary "orders" to be given. Turgenev's cultured landlord ** not only kept away from the stables when he ordered his servants flogged, but even gave the order in a subdued voice to a liveried footman in white gloves: "See that Fiodor gets it. . . ." Now it will be the same here: "No noise"; "orders" will be given nicely and quietly to restrain the immoderate appetites of the starving population.

The fact that Mr. Sipyagin is convinced that the appetites of the starving muzhik are immoderate is not only evident from the persistent warnings contained in the circular against "exaggeration" but from the new regulations it lays down which remove all possibility of exaggeration. Do not hurry to draw up the lists of those in distress, for this will rouse among the population "exaggerated hopes," the Minister states explicitly and orders that the lists be drawn up only immediately before bread is to be distributed. Fur-

* The manner in which the Ministry of the Interior decides this question can be judged from the example of the province of Perm. According to the reports in the latest newspapers, this province is still regarded as having "a good harvest" in spite of the fact that (according to the report of the special county conference of the province held on October 10) the harvest this year *is even worse* than the harvest of 1898, which was an extremely bad one. The yield this year represents only 58 per cent of the average yield, and in the Shadrin and Irbit counties is only 36 per cent and 34 per cent respectively. In 1898 the government granted the province (in addition to local grants) 1,500,000 poods of grain, and over 250,000 rubles in money. Now, however, the Zemstvos have no funds, they are restricted in their powers, the harvest is far worse than that of 1898, the price of bread began to rise *already on July 1*, the peasants *are already selling their cattle*—and the government nevertheless obstinately insists that the province has "a good harvest"!!

** In *A Sportsman's Sketches.—Ed.*

thermore, it is not stated in the circular when a county *should be* regarded as a distressed area; that is regarded as superfluous; but it is distinctly stated when a county *should not be* regarded as a distressed area (for example, when not more than one-third of the volosts are affected, when subsidiary earnings are available, etc.). Finally, in regard to the rate of relief to be granted to the famine-stricken, the Minister introduces regulations which show very clearly that the government desires *at all costs* to cut down these grants to the very minimum, to mere doles, that will not in the least prevent the population from dying from starvation. In fact: forty-eight poods of grain per family (calculated on the average yield of the harvest in each village); those who possess not less than that—are not in distress. How this figure was arrived at—no one knows. All that is known is that in *non*-famine years the poorest peasant consumes twice as much grain (*cf.* Zemstvo Statistical Investigation of Peasants' Budgets). Consequently, undernourishment is a normal state according to the Minister of the Interior. But even this rate is reduced, first by half, in order to prevent the working elements, which represent about fifty per cent of the population, from obtaining loans, *and then* by one-third, one-fifth and one-tenth, "in proportion to the approximate number of well-to-do farmers having reserve stocks left over from last year, or any other [this is precisely what it says: "or any other"!!] material reserves." One can judge, therefore, what an insignificant fraction of the amount of grain the population actually requires will be represented by the loan the government intends to grant! And, as if rejoicing in his insolence, Mr. Sipyagin, in explaining this incredible system of curtailing relief, declares that such an approximate calculation "rarely proves to be to any extent exaggerated." Comment is obviously superfluous.

Whenever official declarations of the Russian government contain something more than bare instructions, and make at least some attempt to explain these instructions, they almost invariably—it is a kind of law more constant than the majority of our laws—advance two principal motives or rather two principal types of motives. On the one hand, you will invariably find a number of general phrases, written in pompous style, about the official concern and desire to meet the requirements of the time and the wishes of public opinion. For example, reference is made to the "important task of averting a shortage of food among the rural population," to the

"moral responsibility for the welfare of the local population," etc. It goes without saying that these commonplaces signify nothing, and impose no obligation whatever, but they are as alike as two peas to the immortal speeches delivered by the immortal Judas Golovlev * to the peasants, whom he robbed and swindled. In parentheses it must be said that these commonplaces are always exploited (sometimes out of simple-mindedness and sometimes as a "duty") by the liberal, censored press in order to demonstrate that the government shares its point-of-view.

But if the other less general and less obviously vapid motives of the government's orders are examined, concrete statements will always be found *which wholly go to confirm* the established arguments of the most reactionary organs of our press (for example, *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*). To our mind, it would be useful (and not altogether impossible even for our legal political workers) to trace and note each occasion when the government's declarations coincide with those of the *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti.* In the circular we are discussing, for example, we find a repetition of the despicable accusations that emanate from the most "savage landlords" to the effect that premature drawing up of lists of the distressed stimulates "efforts among certain well-to-do householders to give their households the appearance of poverty by selling their supplies, reserves and stock." The Minister of the Interior states that this "has been proved by the experience of previous food campaigns." Consequently? Consequently, the Minister of the Interior acquires his political experience from the lessons taught him by the most hidebound serf-owners, who raised such a clamour in previous famine years, who are clamouring now about the deceitful peasants, and who are so indignant about the "noise" that is being raised about the epidemic of famine typhus.

It was from these serf-owners also that Mr. Sipyagin learned to talk about demoralisation. "It is extremely important," he writes, "for . . . the local institutions . . . to help to husband the funds that have been allocated, and above all [*sic!!*] to prevent government relief being granted to persons who are provided for, as this has a harmful and demoralising effect." And this shameless instruction to help to husband the funds is sealed by the following advice based on point of principle:

* A character in Saltykov-Shchedrin's *The Golovlevs.—Ed.*

. . . The wide distribution of food grants to those families that can dispense with them [those families that can live on twenty-four poods of grain a year?], apart from being an unproductive [!] expenditure of state funds, will be not less harmful from the point-of-view of the benefits and requirements of the state than if those really in distress were left without proper aid.

In olden times, sentimental monarchs said: "It is better to acquit ten criminals rather than convict one innocent man" *; but nowadays the immediate counsellor of the Tsar declares: It is as harmful to give relief to families who have to live on twenty-four poods of grain a year as to leave families "really" in distress without relief. What a pity it is that this magnificently frank "point-of-view" regarding "the benefits and requirements of the state" is obscured from the eyes of the broad public by a lengthy and dull circular! One hope is left: Perhaps the Social-Democratic press and Social-Democratic oral agitation will enable the people to become more closely acquainted with the contents of the ministerial circular.

But the circular directs a specially vigorous "attack" upon private philanthropists. Apparently the administrators, who are conducting war against the famine-stricken, consider the most important "enemy" position to be private relief circles, private food kitchens, etc. With a frankness deserving of full recognition Mr. Sipyagin explains why private philanthropy has for a long time now disturbed the slumbers of the Ministry of the Interior.

Commencing from the bad harvest of 1891 and 1892, and during all subsequent calamities of a similar kind [says the circular], it has not infrequently been found that certain philanthropists, while rendering material aid to the inhabitants of the affected districts, strive to rouse in their midst dissatisfaction with the existing order of things, and stimulate totally unjustified demands upon the government. At the same time the failure to meet the distress to the full, and the inevitable ailments and disturbances of industry that arise from that, create very favourable ground for anti-government agitation which is freely taken advantage of by politically unreliable persons for the pursuit of their criminal aims conducted under the cloak of helping their neighbour. Usually, as soon as the first news of a serious shortage of grain is received, persons with not irreproachable political pasts stream into the affected districts from all directions, strive to enter into contact with representatives of charitable organisations in the capital who have come into the district, and who, through ignorance, engage these persons as helpers, and in this way create serious troubles to the interests of good order and administration.

The Russian government is becoming hard pressed in the land of Russia. There was a time when only the students were kept under

* This saying is attributed to Catherine II.—*Ed.*

special guard: the most strict surveillance was kept over them, contact with them on the part of persons with not irreproachable pasts was regarded as a great offence, every circle and society which pursued purely philanthropic aims was suspected of anti-government aims, etc. In those very recent times, there was no other *stratum*, let alone class of the population, that in the eyes of the government, represented "an extremely favourable soil for anti-government agitation." But since the middle of the nineties official government communications have pointed to another and immeasureably more numerous class of the population as requiring special surveillance —the factory workers. The growth of the labour movement compelled the government to establish a whole system of institutions to maintain surveillance over this new rebellious element. Among the districts prohibited as places of residence for politically doubtful persons were included, in addition to the capitals, and university cities, factory centres and settlements, counties and whole provinces.* Two-thirds of European Russia was placed under special protection against unreliables, and the remaining third is becoming so crowded with "persons with not irreproachable political pasts" that even the most remote province is becoming restless.** It now appears according to the authoritative judgement of so competent a person as the Minister of the Interior that even the most remote *village* represents "favourable soil" for anti-governmental agitation, in so far as cases of not fully satisfied distress and ailments and disturbance of industry are to be observed there. But are there many Russian villages in which "cases" like these are not a permanent phenomenon? And should not we Russian Social-Democrats immediately take advantage of Mr. Sipyagin's instructive reference to the "favourable" soil? Precisely at this moment, the rural districts are beginning to display interest in the rumours, that somewhere and somehow have managed to penetrate to them, about the skirmishes that occurred between the urban proletariat, the young intelligentsia and the government's gendarmes in February and March, and more-

* See, for example, the secret circular reproduced in *Iskra*, No. 6, concerning the deportations from St. Petersburg, principally of authors, many of whom have never had any connection with political affairs of any kind, let alone "labour" affairs. Nevertheless they were prohibited not only from living in university towns, but also in "factory districts," while several were prohibited from residing in factory districts *only*.

** See, for example, the correspondence in Nos. 6-7 of *Iskra*, showing that unrest and anti-government sentiments had penetrated even into such pious cities as Penza, Simferopol, Kursk, etc.[116]

over, do not phrases like the muzhik's "totally unjustified demands," etc., provide a sufficiently wide programme for the most extensive and all-sided agitation?

We must accept Mr. Sipyagin's useful suggestion, and ridicule his simplicity; for he is indeed ridiculously simple to imagine that by placing private charity under the surveillance and control of the provincial governor, he can hinder the spread of the influence of "unreliable" persons in the rural districts. Genuine philanthropists have never pursued political aims; so the new measures of prohibition and restriction will mostly affect the very persons who are least dangerous to the government. Those, however, who desire to open the eyes of the peasants to the real significance of these measures, and to the government's attitude towards the famine, will not consider it necessary to establish contact with the representatives of the Red Cross or present themselves to the provincial governors. For example: When it was found that factory districts were "favourable soil," those who desired to establish contact with the workers did not visit the factory managers to ask for information about factory conditions or present themselves to the factory inspectors to ask for permission to organise meetings with the workers. We are fully aware, of course, that it is extremely difficult to carry on agitation among the peasantry, the more so that it is impossible and irrational to withdraw revolutionary forces from the cities for that purpose. But we must not lose sight of the fact, however, that the government's exploits, like that of restricting private charity, removes a good half of these difficulties and does half our work for us.

We shall not dwell on the Ministry of the Interior's circular calling for more strict surveillance over charitable concerts, theatrical performances, etc., for that is a "bagatelle" compared with the circular we have just examined [see article, "Fresh Obstacles," *Iskra*, No. 9].

We shall endeavour to examine the relation that exists now between the government's aid to the population, the fixing and distribution of that aid according to the new regulations and the actual extent of the distress. It is true that our information on this point is scanty to the last degree. The press now is muzzled as never before, the voices of private organisers of food kitchens have been

silenced simultaneously with the "prohibition" of their activities, and the only source of information the Russian public, now panic-stricken by the new stringent measures, have are the official police reports about the favourable progress of the food campaign, the articles written in the same spirit in *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, sometimes the interviews of an adroit reporter with some pompadour * or other, pompously expatiating on "His Excellency's singleness of mind and His Excellency's singleness of authority, etc."[117] For example: *Novoye Vremya*, No. 9195, reports that the governor of Saratov (formerly of Archangel), A. P. Engelhardt, gave an interview to a representative of the local newspaper in the course of which he said that he, the governor, had personally convened a conference of marshals of the nobility, of representatives of county administrations, Zemstvo chiefs, and representatives of the Red Cross and "distributed tasks."

> Scurvy, in the form I have seen it in the province of Archangel, is not observed here [said A. P. Engelhardt]. In Archangel, one dare not approach nearer than five paces to a patient; there the disease is really "rotten." Here we see mostly the effects of severe anæmia, which results from the awful conditions of domestic life. Almost the only symptoms of scurvy observed here are white lips and white gums. . . . With proper nutrition such patients recover within a week. Food is now being distributed. About one thousand rations are being distributed per day, although the number in extreme distress does not exceed four hundred.
>
> Besides scurvy, only three cases of typhus have been reported in the whole district. We may hope that things will not get worse, for everywhere public works have been organised and the population is assured of employment.[118]

What prosperity! In the whole of the county of Khvalynsk (to which the pompadour refers), there are only four hundred persons in acute distress (in all probability the rest, in Mr. Sipyagin's and Mr. Engelhardt's opinion, can get along very well with twenty-four poods of grain per annum per family!), the population is already provided for, and the sick recover within a week. After this, how can we not believe *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* when, in a special leading article (in No. 258), it informs us that

> according to the latest reports, in twelve provinces affected by the bad harvest *the administration is carrying on active work for the arrangement of*

* Marquise de Pompadour (1721-1764), mistress of Louis XV of France, who exercised a great influence over the government. The Russian satyrist Saltykov-Shchedrin in his novel *The Pompadours* refers to the officials and their wives who used their positions for personal gain or to secure protection and advancement for their friends.—*Ed.*

relief. Many counties have already been investigated for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is a shortage of food; *appointments have been made of county managers* of food affairs, etc. Apparently, official representatives of the government are doing all that is possible to render timely and adequate aid.[119]

"Active work is being carried on" and . . . "not more than four hundred cases of acute distress have been registered. . . ." In the county of Khvalynsk there are 165,000 rural inhabitants, and one thousand rations are distributed. The yield of the harvest in the whole of the Southeastern district (including the province of Saratov) this year was 34 per cent below the average. Of the total area of peasant lands, in the province of Saratov, of 1,500,000 desyatinas, 15 per cent has suffered a complete failure of the harvest (according to the report of the county administration), and 75 per cent has suffered a bad harvest, while the counties of Khvalynsk and Kamyshin are the two worst affected districts in the province of Saratov. Consequently, the total amount of grain collected by the peasants in the county of Khvalynsk is not less than 30 per cent below the average. Let us suppose that half of this shortage applies to the well-to-do peasantry who are not reduced to starvation as a result of it (a very risky assumption to make, because the well-to-do peasant possesses better land and cultivates it better and consequently always suffers less from bad harvest than do the poor peasants). But even on this assumption, the number of the starving cannot be less than 25,000, *i. e.*, about 15 per cent. And yet the attempt is made to console us with the fact that scurvy in Khvalynsk is not so bad as it is in Archangel, and that there were only three cases of typhus (if only they would prevaricate more cleverly!), and that one thousand rations are distributed (the size of which in all probability, are determined by Sipyagin's system of combating . . . exaggerations).

In regard to the "employment," which Mr. Sipyagin *thrice* takes into account in his circular, in order to avoid exaggeration (once, when he orders that counties, in which auxiliary employments are customary, shall not be regarded as affected areas; a second time, when he orders that the forty-eight poods scale be reduced by half, because 50 per cent of the working population "must" be earning wages; and a third time, when he orders that the last-mentioned scale be reduced by one-third and one-tenth according to local conditions), in regard to employment, not only agricultural but even

non-agricultural earnings have diminished in the province of Saratov. "The bad harvest," we read in the above-mentioned county administration report, "has also affected the handicraftsmen, owing to the drop in the sales of their manufactures. Owing to these circumstances, *a crisis is observed* in the counties in which handicrafts are most highly developed." Among these counties is that of Kamyshin, which has suffered most of all, and in which many thousands of poor people are engaged in the celebrated sarpin industry.* Even in ordinary years, conditions in this remote rural district were awful. For example, children of six and seven years of age were employed for seven or eight kopecks per day. We can picture to ourselves what conditions are like there in a year of severe harvest failure and acute crisis in the handicraft industry.

In the province of Saratov (and in all the affected provinces, of course), the bad grain harvest is accompanied also by a shortage of fodder. During the last few months (*i. e.*, already in the second half of the summer!), the spread of various cattle diseases and an increase in the mortality of cattle have been observed. According to the reports of the veterinary surgeons in the county of Khvalynsk (we quote this from the newspaper [120] which contained the report of the county administration mentioned above) an examination of the contents of the stomachs of the dead cattle revealed nothing but earth.

The "report of the Zemstvo department of the Ministry of the Interior" [121] concerning the progress of the food campaign contained the statement that of the counties recognised as affected areas "in the county of Khvalynsk alone have cases of epidemic scurvy been discovered in two villages since July. The local medical staff are exerting all their efforts to stop the epidemic. Two Red Cross detachments have been sent to the district to assist the local workers, and according to the reports received by the provincial governor (the very A. P. Engelhardt, whose acquaintance we have already made), their efforts are meeting with considerable success. According to the reports received by the Ministry of the Interior up to September 12, in none of the other affected counties were there any cases of acute distress left without relief, and no development of disease as a consequence of inadequate nutrition is observed."

To show what confidence may be placed in the statement that no

* Sarpin—a handwoven cotton cloth noted for its hard-wearing quality.—*Ed.*

cases of *acute* distress were left unrelieved (were there cases of *chronic* distress?) and that the development of disease is not observed, we shall quote the facts about two other provinces.

In the Ufa province, the counties of Menzelinsk and Belebeyev were declared to be affected areas, and the rural department of the Ministry of the Interior reports that "according to the governor's statement" the amount of the government grant required "for food" is 300,000 poods. A special conference of the Ufa Zemstvo convened on August 27 for the purpose of discussing the question of rendering relief to the famine-stricken, calculated the requirements of food at 2,200,000 poods plus 1,000,000 poods for the other counties, apart from grants of seed-grain (3,200,000 poods for the whole province) and apart from cattle fodder (600,000 poods). Consequently, the Ministry of the Interior fixed the grant *at one-fourth* of that fixed by the Zemstvo.

Another example. In the province of Viatka, none of the counties were declared to be an affected area at the time the rural department of the Ministry of the Interior issued its report; nevertheless, the grant for food was fixed by that very body at 782,000 poods. This is the figure which, according to the reports in the newspapers, was fixed by the Viatka Provincial Food Department at its meeting on August 28 (arrived at in accordance with the decisions of the county assemblies held between August 18 and 25). *Approximately on August 12, these very assemblies* had fixed the amount of the loan differently, *i. e.*, 1,100,000 poods for food and 1,400,000 poods for seeds. Why this difference? What happened between August 12 and 28? The answer is, Sipyagin's circular of August 17 was issued. Consequently, the circular had an immediate effect, and the trifling amount of 230,000 poods of grain was struck out of the estimate, drawn up, mark you, by the county assemblies, *i. e.*, by the very institutions which, by the law of June 12, 1900, were established in place of the unreliable Zemstvos, institutions composed of officials generally and of Zemstvo chiefs in particular. . . . Shall we really live to see the day when even the Zemstvo chiefs will be accused of being liberals? Perhaps! Recently we read in *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* the following reprimands addressed to a certain Mr. Om., who, in the *Priazovsky Krai* [*Azov Region*] [122] had dared to propose that the newspapers publish the minutes of the meeting of the Provincial Boards for Urban Affairs

(since representatives of the press could not be permitted to attend the meetings):

> The purpose is too transparent: *The Russian bureaucrat frequently suffers from a fear to appear unliberal,* and publicity may compel him, sometimes even against his own conscience, to support some fantastically liberal scheme proposed by the city or Zemstvo. The calculation is not altogether an erroneous one.[123]

Should not the Viatka Zemstvo chiefs who (apparently out of fear of appearing unliberal) have revealed such unpardonable frivolity in "exaggerating" the food crisis, be placed under special surveillance? *

Had not the wise Russian government removed it from the management of food affairs, the "fantastically liberal" Viatka Zemstvo would have made an even more gloomy report of the distress than it did. At all events, the Special Provincial Conference, which was held from August 30 to December 2, defined the shortage of grain for human consumption at 17 per cent below the minimum, and that of cattle fodder at 15 per cent below the minimum. And it defined the minimum at 105,000,000 poods (the amount collected in an ordinary year is 134,000,000; the amount collected this year, 84,000,000 poods). Consequently the shortage amounts to *21,000,000 poods.* "The total number of volosts in the province suffering from a shortage of grain this year is 158 out of 310. The population of these volosts number 1,566,000 persons of both sexes." Yes, undoubtedly, "the administration is busily engaged" in minimising the real extent of the distress, and in reducing the work of relieving the starving to a kind of acrobatics of cheeseparing philanthropy.

* Here is another example of the manner in which the governor of Viatka combats exaggerations:

In an "announcement" sent out to the volost administrations, the governor of Viatka takes note of the care with which the peasants dispose of the loan granted to them by the government and the Zemstvo. "During my tour over the province," writes Mr. Klingenberg, "I saw for myself how cautiously the peasants act in the present circumstances. They hesitate to contract debts unless absolutely forced to do so by extreme necessity, and have firmly resolved to wait patiently for God's help next year and strive by their own efforts to extricate themselves from their difficult conditions." Hence, the chief of the Viatka province expresses the assurance that "the peaceful and sensible inhabitants of the province of Viatka will not allow themselves to be disturbed by rumours about free government and Zemstvo aid and of the annulment of debts and arrears, or by exaggerated reports of the failure of the harvest." The governor thinks it his duty to warn the peasant popula-

In fact, the term "acrobats of philanthropy" would be too flattering a name for the administrators who have rallied under the banner of the Sipyagin circular. The thing they have in common with acrobats of philanthropy is the paltry nature of the relief they render and their striving to make it appear much greater than it is. But the acrobats of philanthropy at the worst regard the people upon whom they devote their charity as playthings, who pleasantly tickle their vanity, while the Sipyagin administrators regard their beneficiaries as enemies; they look upon them as people who are making illegal demands ("totally unjustified demands upon the government"), and who therefore must be held in restraint. This point-of-view was expressed most strikingly in the remarkable Provisional Regulations which received His Majesty's gracious sanction on September 15, 1901.

These regulations represent a complete law consisting of twenty clauses. There is so much that is remarkable in it that we would not hesitate to designate it as one of the most important legislative acts of the beginning of the twentieth century. Let us start with the title: "Provisional Regulations Governing the *Participation* of the Population in the Famine Affected Areas in the Works Carried Out Under the Orders of the Departments of Communications, of Agriculture and of State Property." Evidently these works are so stuffed with benefits that to be allowed to "participate" in them must be regarded as a special act of grace, otherwise the first clause of this new law would not state: "Rural inhabitants of localities affected by the famine *shall be allowed to participate* in the carrying out of works," etc.

But the law deals with these privileges only in the second half,

tion that "if on investigation, it is found that householders who, while not having reserve stocks have nevertheless gathered in sufficient corn this year to feed themselves and their families and to sow their fields, and have sold their corn and utilised the money thus obtained for other purposes, such householders must not count on obtaining a loan. According to the new law, the loans granted will not be recoverable on the basis of collective responsibility [*i. e.*, the collective responsibility of the whole village.—*Ed.*] but in accordance with the regulations governing the collection of taxes. Consequently, every householder who applies for and receives a loan must bear in mind that he alone must repay it, that no one will assist him to do so, that the repayment will be strictly enforced, and if he falls into arrears, all his movable property may be sold and his immovable property confiscated."

If this is an example of the announcements sent out by the governor, we can imagine how the local volost bureaucrats treat the famine-stricken peasants who have fallen in arrears and apply for a loan.

while in the first half it deals with the *organisation* of the business. The competent authorities "determine the most suitable work to be undertaken (Clause 2) "which shall be carried out in the manner prescribed by the law" (Clause 3, which, like the chapter headings in certain of Dickens's novels may be entitled: "The Clause of the new law, which deals with the necessity of acting in accordance with the old law." The work is to be paid for out of the budget, or by means of special credits, and the supervision of the organisation of this work is vested in the Minister of the Interior, who is empowered to appoint special representatives for the purpose, and who appoints a special Committee for Food Affairs consisting of representatives of various ministries under the chairmanship of the Assistant Minister of the Interior. The functions of this committee are: (*a*) To grant permission for departures to be made from the existing regulations; (*b*) To discuss proposals for the allocation of funds; (*c*) "To fix the maximum of remuneration to be paid to workers, and also to determine the other conditions under which the population may be permitted to participate in the aforesaid works; (*d*) To distribute the consignments of workers among the districts where these works are being carried out; and (*e*) To supervise the conveyance of these consignments of workers to the places where the work is to be carried out." The decisions of the committee must be sanctioned by the Minister of the Interior, and also "in the proper cases" by the ministers of other departments. The function of determining the kind of work to be undertaken, and the number of persons in need of such work, is vested in the Zemstvo chiefs who must report this information to the provincial governors. The latter, in their turn, communicate their opinion to the Ministry of the Interior, and "on its instructions arrange, through the Zemstvo chiefs, for the conveyance of the workers to the places where the works are to be carried out. . . ."

Ugh! We have mastered the "organisation" of this business at last! The question now arises, How much lubrication will be required to keep all the wheels of this ponderous, purely Russian administrative machine going? Try to imagine this thing concretely. The Zemstvo chief comes in immediate contact with the famine-stricken. He must take the initiative. He sends a communication—to whom? To the provincial governor, say the Provisional Regulations of September 15. But in accordance with the circular of August 17, a special Central County Administration for

Food Affairs has been established, the function of which is "to concentrate the management *of all* food affairs in the county in the hands of a single official" (under the circular of August 17 the county marshal of nobility should preferably be appointed to that post). A "dispute" arises, which, of course, is quickly settled on the basis of the remarkably clear and simple "principles" outlined in the six points of Clause 175 of the General Provincial Regulations which prescribes "the order for settling disputes . . . between public departments and officials." Finally, the document finds its way somehow into the office of the provincial governor, where some one sets to work to draft an "opinion." When that is done it is all sent to St. Petersburg and submitted to a special committee. But the representative of the Ministry of Ways and Communications on the committee is unable to decide as to whether work for the repair of the roads in the Bugurusslan county is expedient or not, and so another document travels from St. Petersburg to the province and back again. When, finally, the expediency of the work, etc., etc., is decided on in principle, the committee in St. Petersburg will then set to work to "distribute the consignments of workers" between the Buzuluk and Bugurusslan counties.

Why was this unwieldly machine set up? Because the work is new? Not a bit. Before the Provisional Regulations of September 15 were introduced, public works could be organised ever so much more simply "on the basis of the existing laws," and the circular of August 17, which refers to the public work organised by the Zemstvo, the guardians of the poor, and the provincial authorities, makes no reference to the necessity for any kind of special organisation. You see, therefore, that "the government's food campaign consists of the St. Petersburg departments spending a whole month (from August 17 to September 15) thinking and thinking, and finally producing a hopelessly tangled skein of red-tape. We may be sure that the St. Petersburg committee stands in no danger of dropping into exaggerations as do the local bureaucrats who "fear to appear unliberal. . . ."

But the best of this bunch of new Provisional Regulations is the one concerning the "rural inhabitants" hired for the work. When work is to be carried out, "away from their place of residence," the workers must first of all form themselves into a special artel, "under the surveillance of the Zemstvo chief," who endorses the appointment of the head man of the artel, who is to be responsible

for maintaining order. Secondly, the names of the workers joining such an artel must be entered on a special list which "is to serve as a *substitute* for their ordinary legally established identity certificates during their transfer to and stay at their place of work, and must remain in the possession of the official accompanying the workers on their journey, or, in his absence, in the possession of the artel elder, and on arrival at the place of destination must be placed in charge of the manager of the works."

Why is it necessary to substitute ordinary passports, which every peasant who desires to travel has a right to receive gratis, by a special list? This, undoubtedly, is a restriction imposed upon the workers, because, if they remained in possession of their passports, they would have more freedom in the selection of a room, in the spending of their free time, or in changing one job for another, if they found it more remunerative or convenient to do so. We shall see later on that this was done deliberately, not only out of a love for red-tape, but in order to impose restrictions upon the workers, and to make their conditions approximate to those of the gangs of transported serfs accompanied by "an inventory." It appears that the function of "maintaining proper order on the journey, and the delivery [*sic!*] of the consignment of workers to the works manager is vested in an official especially commissioned for the purpose by the Ministry of the Interior." The more we advance, the more we discover. The substitution of lists for passports leads to the substitution of freedom of movement by—"delivery of consignments." Are these the gangs of convicts being transported to penal servitude? Have all the laws, which lay it down that the peasant, having obtained a passport, may travel wherever and however he pleases, been repealed—perhaps as a punishment for "exaggerating" the famine? Is conveyance at government expense a sufficient reason for depriving a citizen of his rights?

It appears that the persons in charge of distributing the workers and of paying their wages and the other officials supervising the carrying out of the work of the department, "on the instructions of the provincial officials in the district where the families of the workers reside, deduct, wherever possible, part of the wages earned and send them to the proper place for the maintenance of the workers' families." A further deprivation of rights. How dare the officials deduct part of the wages earned by the workers? How dare they interfere in the workers' family affairs and decide for them, as if

they were serfs, whom they are to maintain and how much they are to devote for that purpose? Would factory workers permit the employer to deduct part of their wages without their consent? Apparently, this question entered the heads of those who drafted the new "penal regulations," because the very next clause following on the one we have just quoted says: "The preservation of order among the workers in those places where work is carried on, is entrusted by the order of the Ministry of the Interior, to the local Zemstvo chiefs, the officers of the special corps of gendarmerie, the police officials, or persons especially appointed for that purpose." It sounds positively as if the peasants are to be *punished* by deprivation of rights for "exaggerating" the famine, and for their "totally unjustified demands on the government"! It is not enough that the ordinary police, the factory police and the secret police keep the workers under surveillance; these regulations prescribe the establishment of a *special* surveillance. Has the government completely lost its head out of fear of these consignments of hungry peasants, transported, delivered and redelivered with a thousand precautions?

Further on we read:

> Workers guilty of disturbing the public peace and quiet, shirking their work, or refusing to carry out the lawful demands of the works' managers, or those appointed for the purpose of preserving order, are liable, on the order of the officials mentioned in Clause 16 [to which we have just referred] to be placed under arrest *for three days without trial;* for persistent shirking they, on the orders of the said officials, may be transported *under escort* to their permanent place of residence.

After this, can the Provisional Regulations of September 15 be described as anything else than provisional penal regulations? Punishment without trial, deportation under escort. . . . The ignorance and wretchedness of the Russian peasant is very great indeed, but there is a limit to all things. This constant starvation, and the steady migration of workers deported from the towns into the country cannot but have their effect. And our government, which is so fond of governing by means of provisional regulations * will one day receive a very severe shock.

The Provisional Regulations of September 15 must serve us as a

* Long ago it was said that any fool could govern under a state of siege. In Europe, it may be necessary to declare a state of siege from time to time, but not in Russia. In Russia, a state of siege is always in force, and is supplemented from time to time by provisional regulations. Why, all political affairs in Russia are conducted according to provisional regulations.

means for wide agitation in workers' study circles and among the peasantry. *We must distribute* copies of these regulations in leaflet form, supplemented with our comments and explanations; we must call meetings, and read this law to the audience, explain its meaning to them, and show its connection with the whole of the government's "food" policy. We must see to it that every worker, who is at all class conscious and who goes to the country, shall thoroughly understand the meaning of these provisional penal regulations, and be able to explain to all those he meets what these regulations are about, and what they must do to liberate themselves from penal servitude, which consists of starvation, tyranny and lack of legal guarantees.

To the kind-hearted Russian intellectuals who advocate the establishment of various kinds of artels and similar legal societies permitted or encouraged by the government, let these provisional regulations governing *workers' artels* serve as a standing reproach and serious warning: a reproach to the simplicity with which they believed in the sincerity of the government's permission or encouragement, without perceiving the despicable serf character that was concealed behind the sign-board of "the furtherance of people's labour," etc. A warning that when speaking in the future of artels and other societies permitted by the Sipyagins, never to forget to tell the whole truth about the workers' artels that are governed by the provisional regulations of September 15, or if they dare not talk about *such* artels, to remain altogether silent.

II

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CRISIS AND THE FAMINE

WHILE we are faced with a fresh outbreak of famine, the old and protracted commercial and industrial crisis still continues, and as a result, tens of thousands of workers are walking the streets unable to find employment. Distress is rampant among these workers, and this makes the difference between the attitude of the government and of the educated "public" towards the distress of the workers and their attitude towards the distress of the peasants all the more striking. The public institutions and the press make no effort to determine the number of workers in distress, or the degree of that distress, as is done approximately in the case of the peasants. No

systematic measures are adopted to organise aid for the starving workers.

Why this difference? It is not, in our opinion, because the distress among the workers is less apparent, or reveals itself in less acute forms. It is true that the city dwellers who do not belong to the working class know very little about the conditions of the factory workers; they do not know that they live more crowded than ever in cellars and attics, that they are starving more than ever they did before, selling their last sticks of furniture to the usurers. It is true that the increasing number of tramps and beggars who frequent lodging houses, and fill the prisons and hospitals, do not attract any particular attention because, well, "every one" is accustomed to the idea that doss houses and dens of the direst wretchedness are always filled in large cities. It is true that, unlike the peasants, unemployed workers are not tied down to a single place, but roam to all parts of the country seeking employment, or are deported to "their native places" by the authorities, who are afraid of allowing large numbers of unemployed workers to accumulate in the cities. Nevertheless, any one who has any contact at all with industrial life, and who observes public life knows, from reading the newspapers, that unemployment is steadily increasing.

No, the reason for this difference in attitude lies much deeper. It is due to the fact that famine in the rural districts, and unemployment in the cities, belong to two altogether different forms of economic life, and to the altogether different relationships that exist between the exploiting and the exploited classes in the two different forms. In the rural districts, the relations between the exploiting and exploited classes are extremely confused and complicated by a multiplicity of transitional forms, as for example, when farming is combined with usury, or with the exploitation of wage-labour, etc. It is not the agricultural wage labourer—the antagonism of whose interests to the interests of the landlord and wealthy peasant is clearly apparent, and is largely understood by the labourers themselves—who is starving, but the small peasants, who are usually regarded (and regard themelves) as independent farmers, who only now and again, for accidental reasons fall into "temporary" dependence. The immediate cause of the famine—the failure of the harvest—is attributed by the masses to the will of God. And as bad harvests accompanied by famine have occurred from time immemorial, the legislature long ago was compelled to reckon with it.

For years a multitude of laws have existed (principally on paper) providing for the distribution of food among the people, and prescribing a whole system of "measures." These measures, borrowed largely from the period of serfdom and the period when patriarchal, self-sufficing economy prevailed, correspond very little to the requirements of modern times. Nevertheless, every year they set into motion the whole administrative and rural government machine. And however greatly the government of the propertied classes desire it, this machine finds it almost impossible to avoid resorting to the aid of the hated "third persons," the intellectuals, who are striving to "make a noise." On the other hand, the connection between the famine and the bad harvest, and the wretched state of the peasants—who do not understand (or very vaguely understand) that it is the increasing exploitation of capital resulting from the predatory policy of the government and of the landlords that has reduced them to this distress—has caused the famine-stricken to feel absolutely helpless, so that, far from putting forward "exacting demands," they put forward no demands at all.

The less conscious the oppressed class is of its oppression, and the less exacting it is in its demands upon its oppressors, the larger will be the number of individuals among the propertied classes inclined towards philanthropy, and the less, relatively, will resistance be offered to this philanthropy by the local landlords, who are directly interested in keeping the peasants in a state of poverty. If this indisputable fact is borne in mind, it will be clear that the increased opposition of the landlords, the loud cries raised about the "demoralisation" of the muzhiks, and finally, the purely military measures adopted by the government actuated by that spirit against the famine-stricken and against the philanthropists, are symptoms of the complete decline and decay of that ancient, supposedly immutable and time-hallowed patriarchal rural life over which the most rabid Slavophils, the most class-conscious reactionaries, and the most naïve of the old-fashioned Narodniks, wax so enthusiastic. The Narodniks have always accused us Social-Democrats of artificially applying the concept of the class struggle to conditions which do not fit in with it at all, while the reactionaries accuse us of sowing class hatred and of inciting "one section of the population against the other." We shall not repeat the reply to these charges, for it has been made a score of times already; we shall state merely that the Russian government *excels us all* in understanding the

profundity of the class struggle, and in the energy with which it adopts the measures that logically follow from such an understanding. Every one who has in one way or another come in contact with people who in famine years have gone to the country to "feed" the peasants—and who has not come in contact with them?—knows that they were prompted to do that by pure sentiments of pity and human sympathy for suffering, and that they were totally alien to all "political" plans whatsoever; that the propaganda of the ideas of the class struggle left these people absolutely cold, and that the arguments of the Marxists and their heated battles with the views of the Narodniks on the rural problem, left these people unconvinced. What has the class struggle got to do with it? they said. The peasants are starving and we must help them—that is all.

But those who cannot be convinced by the arguments of the Marxists may be convinced by the "arguments" of the Minister of the Interior. No, it is not simply that "the peasants are starving," he warns the philanthropists, and they must not "simply" go to help the peasants without the permission of the government, for that spreads demoralisation, and stimulates unjustifiable demands. To interfere in the food campaign means to interfere in the divine and police plans to provide the landlords with workers willing to work almost for nothing, and the Treasury with taxes collected by force. He who ponders over Sipyagin's circular must say to himself: Yes, social war is going on in our countryside, and as in all wars, the belligerents will not forego their right to examine the cargoes of vessels sailing to enemy ports, even if they sail under neutral flags. The only difference between this and other wars, is that in this case one side is obliged eternally to work and eternally to starve; it does not even fight, it is the one that is merely being slaughtered . . . for the present.

In industry, however, there is no doubt about this war being carried on, and there is no need *in government circulars* to explain to the "neutral" philanthropists that it is unwise to ford the river without first sounding its depth (that is, without first obtaining the permission of the authorities and of the capitalists). Already in 1885, when there were no signs as yet of any marked Socialist agitation amongst the workers, even in the central provinces, where the workers stand more closely to the peasantry than do the workers in the towns, the industrial crisis caused the atmosphere to become so charged with electricity that storms continuously broke out first

in one place and then in another. Under such circumstances, philanthropy is doomed to impotence from the outset, and for that reason it remains a casual and purely individual affair, without acquiring even a shadow of social significance.

We shall note yet one other peculiar feature in the attitude of the public towards the famine. It may be said without exaggeration that until very recently the opinion prevailed that the whole of the Russian economic and even political system rested upon the *mass* of independent land-owning peasant farmers. The extent to which this opinion had penetrated the minds of thinking people, who are the least bit susceptible to the wiles of official flattery, was strikingly illustrated by Nicolai—on in his book published after the famine of 1891-1892.[124] To allow an enormous number of peasant farms to fall into ruin seemed to every one to be so absurd, such an impossible leap into the void, that the necessity to extend the widest possible aid that would effectively "heal the wounds" was almost universally recognised. And again it was none other than Mr. Sipyagin who undertook the task of dispersing the last shreds of illusion. What does "Russia" rest upon, what do the landowning, the commercial and industrial classes live on, if not on the ruination and impoverishment of the people? To attempt effectively, not only on paper—to heal *this* "wound"—why, that is a political crime!

Mr. Sipyagin will undoubtedly help to implant and spread the truism that there is no other means of combating unemployment and crises—and the Asiatically savage and cruel forms the expropriation of the small producers has assumed in Russia—than the class struggle of the revolutionary proletariat. The masters of the capitalist state are no more concerned about the vastness of the numbers of the victims of famine and crises than a locomotive is concerned about those whom it crushes in its path. The dead bodies retard the wheels; the train stops, it may (if the engine driver is too careless) jump the rails; but after a slight interruption it will ultimately continue on its way. You hear of death from starvation, and of the ruin of tens and hundreds of thousands of small farmers, but at the same time, you hear stories about the progress of agriculture in our country, about the successful capture of foreign markets by the Russian landlords, who have sent excursions of Russian peasants to England; you hear about increased sales and improved implements and the extension of cultivated meadows, etc. For the Russian masters of the land (as well as for all capitalist

masters), the intensified ruination and starvation is nothing more than a slight and temporary hitch, to which they pay almost no attention whatever, unless the famine-stricken *compel* them to do so. Everything goes on as usual—even speculation in the lands of that section of the *proprietors* which represents the well-to-do peasantry.

For example, the Bugurusslan county of the province of Samara has been declared an "affected area." That means that famine and the ruination of the *mass* of the peasantry have reached the highest point. But the misfortune of the masses does not hinder, but on the contrary appears to facilitate, the consolidation of the economic position of the bourgeois minority of the peasantry. In the September correspondence of *Russkiye Vyedomosti,* No. 244, we read the following concerning this very county:

> Bugurusslan county, province of Samara. The most important subject of discussion in this county is the rapid rise in the price of land all over the county and the wild speculation in land caused by that. Only some fifteen or twenty years ago, excellent valley land could be bought at *ten to fifteen rubles* per desyatina. Only three years ago, thirty-five rubles per desyatina was regarded as a high price in some districts lying off the railroad, and only on one occasion was as much as sixty rubles per desyatina paid for first-rate land with a farm-house situated near a market. Now, however, *fifty to sixty rubles* per desyatina is paid for the worst land, and the price of good land has risen to eighty rubles and even to one hundred rubles per desyatina. The speculation caused by this rise in the land prices assumes two forms: first, the purchase of land for the purpose of immediately reselling it [there have been cases when land was bought at forty rubles per desyatina and resold within a year to the local *peasants at fifty-five rubles per desyatina*]. In these cases, it is usually the landlords, who either have not the time or the desire to bother with all the red-tape and formalities of selling the land to the peasants through the Peasant Bank, who sell to the capitalist land speculators, *who in their turn resell to the very muzhiks who occupy it.* In the second form, numerous land agents are engaged in foisting upon peasants living in remote provinces [mostly Little Russians] * all kinds of worthless land for which they obtain large *commissions* from the owners [*from one to two rubles* per desyatina]. From what has been said, it should be clear that the principal victim of this land speculation is *the peasant,* and it is the latter's greed for land that serves as the basis for this unimaginable and inexplicable, from the standpoint of economic laws, leap in the price of land. Of course, the laying down of railways has had something to do with it, but not a great deal, because the principal buyer of land in our county is, as before, the peasant, who by no means regards the railway as a factor of first-class importance.[125]

These tenacious, "shrewd muzhiks," who so greedily invest their "savings" (and plunder) in the purchase of land, will inevitably cause the ruin of even those small peasants who have still managed to survive the present famine.

* Ukrainians.—*Ed.*

While bourgeois society resorts to well-to-do peasant land purchasing schemes as a means of counteracting the ruination and starvation of the poor peasants, the search for new markets is resorted to as a means of counteracting crises and the overstocking of the markets with the products of industry. The reptile press (*Novoye Vremya*, No. 9188)[126] waxes enthusiastic over the successes of the trade commenced with Persia, and discusses in a lively manner the prospects of commerce with Central Asia, and particularly with Manchuria. The iron and other industrial magnates rub their hands in glee when they hear of proposals for further railway expansion. It has been decided to lay down the following big lines, Petersburg-Viatka, Bologoye-Sedlets, Orenburg-Tashkent; the government has guaranteed a railway loan of 37,000,000 rubles (to the Moscow-Kazan, and Lodz-South Eastern Railway Companies) and other lines, such as, Moscow-Kyshtym, the Kamyshin-Astrakhan and Black Sea lines are being planned. The starving peasants and unemployed workers may console themselves with the thought that the state money (if the state can raise it) will not, of course, be spent "unproductively" on famine relief (see Sipyagin's circular), but will be poured into the pockets of engineers and contractors, like those virtuosi in the art of embezzling state funds in Nizhni Novgorod, who over a period of years embezzled large sums during the construction of the Sormovo dam, and who were only recently convicted (as an exception) by the Moscow Assizes in Nizhni-Novgorod.*

* Unfortunately, lack of space prevents us from dealing in greater detail with this trial, which has demonstrated once again how the contractors and engineers carry on. For us Russians this is an old story that is perennially new. The engineer Alexandrov, in company with Shnakenburg, the chief of the Nizhni Novgorod branch of the Kazan region of the Ministry of Communications, and six contractors who were brought to trial *during a period of three years* (1893-1895) "accumulated" for themselves and others, thousands of rubles by presenting to the Treasury accounts, certificates, receipts, etc., etc., for work that was never done. Not only was the work alleged to have been done fictitious, but so also were the contractors who were alleged to have carried out the work. An ordinary clerk signed the receipts in the name of a non-existent contractor! The sums that this fraternity pocketed can be calculated from the following: the engineer Alexandrov submitted accounts (from the "contractors" who found themselves in the dock) for a sum of *over 200,000 rubles*, and in these accounts the sum of 400 rubles, for example, actually expended was altered to 4,400 rubles. According to the evidence of one of the witnesses, engineer Alexandrov squandered large sums of money either with women or with his immediate superiors, the road engineers, spending as much as from fifty to eighty rubles for a single dinner.

III

THE THIRD ELEMENT

THE term "third element" or "third persons" was employed, if we are not mistaken, by the vice-governor of Samara, Kondoidi, in his speech at the opening of the Samara Provincial Zemstvo Assembly in 1900.[127] He used this term to designate persons "belonging neither to the administration nor to the representatives of the estates." The increase in the numbers and influence of such persons serving in the Zemstvo as doctors, technicians, statisticians, agronomists, pedagogues, etc., has long ago attracted the attention of our reactionaries, who have also described these hated "third persons" as the "Zemstvo bureaucracy."

Generally speaking, it must be said that our reactionaries (including, of course, the whole of the higher bureaucracy) reveal a fine political instinct. They are so well-trained in fighting against oppositions, against popular "revolts," religious sects, rebellions

Most interesting of all, however, is the manner in which this affair was conducted and ended. The chief of police, to whom the secret police reported the matter, "refused to take up the case" (!). "This is not our affair," he said, "but the affair of the Ministry of Communications," and the detective had to appeal to the public prosecutor. The whole thing came to light because the thieves fell out: Alexandrov "refused to divide up" with one of the clerk-contractors. The case dragged on *for six years.* Some of the witnesses died in the meantime, and many of them managed to forget the most important points in the case. An important witness like Lokhtin, the ex-chief of the Kazan region of the Ministry of Communications, *could not be found* [*sic!*]; he was at some place, it is not known exactly where, either in Kazan or sent on a commission to Yenisseisk. This is not a joke, reader, it is copied from the report of the trial.

The fact that others, besides those brought to trial, were implicated in the case is apparent from the following: first, the virtuous detective who brought the case to light has left the service; he has purchased a large tenement house, and is now living on the income from it. Second, the engineer Makarov, *chief of the Kazan region of the Ministry of Communications* (who during the construction of the Sormovo dam acted as assistant chief), tried his utmost at the trial to shield Alexandrov. He even declared—literally!—that "*it was perfectly in order*" for the dam to be washed away in the spring of 1894. When he examined Alexandrov's books, he found everything in perfect order; Alexandrov was distinguished for his experience, zeal and accuracy!

The result: Alexandrov—one year's confinement in a fortress; Shnakenburg —a severe reprimand (from which he was absolved by the manifesto of 1896!). The rest were acquitted. The Treasury's claim was disallowed. I can imagine how pleased the undiscovered Lokhtins and the Makarovs, who are still in the service, must be.

and revolutionists that they are always on the *qui vive,* and understand far better than naïve simpletons and "honest fogies" that the autocracy can never reconcile itself to independence, honesty, independent convictions and pride in real knowledge *of any kind whatsoever.* So thoroughly imbued are they with the spirit of subservience and red-tape that prevails in the hierarchy of Russian officialdom that they hold in contempt all those who lack similarity with Gogol's Akaky Akakyevich,* or to use a more modern simile: "The man in the glass case." **

Indeed, if men in public office are to be judged, not by the positions they hold in the service, but by their knowledge and merits, will it not logically and inevitably lead to the creation of freedom of public opinion and public control, which would judge this knowledge and these merits? Will it not undermine the privileges of the estates and ranks upon which alone the Russian autocracy rests? Listen to the argument Kondoidi advances to justify his displeasure:

"Representatives of the estates, sometimes without proper reason, hearken to the words of intellectuals, notwithstanding the fact that the latter are merely salaried servants of the administration, merely because they talk about science or quote something they have learned from newspapers or magazines." *What!* Mere "salaried servants" teach "representatives of the estates!" In passing, it should be said that the members of the Zemstvos, to whom the vice-governor referred, are members of a non-estate institution; but as every institution in our country is thoroughly saturated with the estate spirit, and as the Zemstvo has lost the greater part of its non-estate character, as a result of the passing of the new regulation, therefore, for the sake of brevity it can be said that in Russia there are two governing "classes": 1. The administration, and 2. The representatives of the estates. There is no room for a third element in a monarchy resting on the estates. And if disobedient economic development more and more undermines the foundations of the estates by the very growth of capitalism, and gives rise to the need for "intellectuals," the number of which is continuously increasing,

* Chief character in Gogol's famous story *The Great Coat,* a petty official who thinks of nothing else but his duties.—*Ed.*

** A similar, but modernized type is represented in Chekhov's *The Man in the Glass Case.—Ed.*

then it must be expected that the third element will strive to push out the framework that hems it in.

"The dreams of those belonging neither to the administration nor to the representatives of the estates in the Zemstvo," said Mr. Kondoidi "are fantastic, but if used as a basis for political tendencies, may become harmful."

To concede the existence of "political tendencies" is merely a diplomatic way of admitting that they exist. And the "dreams" referred to here are, if you will, all the assumptions that follow from the interests of the medical profession, as far as doctors are concerned, and from the interests of statistics, as far as statisticians and those who ignore the interests of the governing estates are concerned. In themselves, these dreams are fantastic but, if you please, they foster political discontent.

We shall now relate the attempt of another administrator, the chief of one of the central provinces, to advance a different argument for being displeased with the third element. According to this official, the activities of the Zemstvo in the province *in his charge* "are year by year departing from the principles upon which the regulations governing Zemstvo institutions are based." According to these regulations, the local inhabitants are empowered to manage affairs dealing with local needs and requirements. Owing to the indifference which the majority of landowners display towards the right granted them, "the Zemstvo Assemblies have become *a mere formality,* and affairs are conducted by the administrations in a manner that leaves much to be desired." This "in many administrations has led to the growth of large staffs and to the practice of inviting to the Zemstvo the service of *experts*—statisticians, agronomists, pedagogues, sanitary inspectors, etc.—who, conscious of their *educational* and sometimes their *intellectual superiority* over the members of the Zemstvo, have begun to display *increasing independence,* which, in particular, is achieved by convening all kinds of *assemblies* and by setting up all kinds of committees in the administrations of the province. As a result, the whole of the Zemstvo administration has fallen into the hands of persons *who have nothing in common with the local population.*" Although, "among these persons there is a large number of well-intentioned persons, worthy of the utmost respect, nevertheless, they cannot regard their service as anything else than a means of livelihood, and they are interested in local needs and requirements only to the

extent that their personal welfare depends upon it." In the opinion of the chief of the province, "in Zemstvo affairs, *the hired man cannot take the place of the employer.*" This argument may be described as more cunning or more frank than the previous one mentioned, according as one looks at it. It is more cunning because it makes no mention of political tendencies, and tries to restrict its meaning exclusively to the interest of local needs and requirements. It is more frank because it openly contrasts the "hired man" to the *employer.* This is the time-honoured point of view of the Russian Kit Kitych *, who, in hiring a "mere teacher," is guided principally by the market-price of this particular form of professional service. The real master of everything is the property-owner—proclaims the representative of the camp from which praises are constantly heard of Russia and its strong and absolutely independent government which is above all the classes and which, thank God, is free from the domination of the selfish interests and parliamentary corruption that prevail in Western countries. And since the property-owner is the master, he must be master also of medical, statistical and educational "affairs";—our pompadour does not hesitate to draw this conclusion, which is the open recognition of the political predominance of the propertied classes. What is still more curious, he does not hesitate to admit that these "experts" are conscious of their educational and sometimes intellectual superiority over the members of the Zemstvo. Of course, what other measures can be taken against intellectual superiority than measures of severity? . . .

Recently, our reactionary press had presented to it an excellent opportunity for raising the demand for these measures of severity. The refusal of the intellectuals to permit themselves to be abused like ordinary hired men, like sellers of labour power (instead of being treated like citizens fulfilling definite public functions), has led from time to time to conflicts between the bureaucrats of the administration and the doctors—in consequence of which they used to resign in a body—with the technicians, etc. Recently, the conflicts between the administrations, and the statisticians have assumed a positively epidemic character.

In the May issue of *Iskra* [No. 4], it was reported that the local

* A character in Ostrovsky's play, *We Will Straighten Out Everything Among Ourselves,* typifying a vulgar, tyrannical merchant, conscious of the power of his money.—*Ed.*

authorities in Yaroslavl, for a long time had been dissatisfied with their statisticians, and after the events in St. Petersburg in March, made a thorough "cleansing" of the statistical bureau, and ordered the manager "in future to engage students with extreme caution and to see that there was not the slightest shadow of unreliability among them"[128]. In an article, entitled "Sedition in Vladimir on the Klyazma" [June issue of *Iskra*, No. 5], the conditions of the suspected statisticians, and the reasons for the dislike exhibited towards them by the provincial governor, the manufacturers and the landlords were described. The dismissal of the Vladimir statisticians for having despatched a telegram expressing sympathy with Annensky (who was beaten up on the Kazan Square on March 4) led to the statistical bureau being practically closed down, and as statisticians from other towns refused to serve in a Zemstvo that was unable to protect the interests of its employees, the local gendarmerie was obliged to act as mediators between the dismissed statisticians and the provincial governor. "A gendarme visited several of the statisticians at their homes and suggested to them that they send in a request for re-instatement," but his mission was a complete failure. Finally, in the August issue of *Iskra* [No. 7], an "incident in the Yekaterinoslav Zemstvo" was reported in which "Pasha" Rodzianko (the chairman of the provincial land department) dismissed statisticians for failing to carry out the "order" to keep a diary, and this led to the resignation of all the other members of the bureau, and the despatch of a letter of protest in the name of the Kharkov statisticians (reproduced in the same number of *Iskra*). Then things began to get lively. The Kharkov Pasha, Mr. Gordeyenko (also chairman of the provincial land department), intervened and declared to "his" statisticians that "he will not tolerate within the walls of his department any meetings of employees called to discuss questions that do not concern their duties." The Kharkov statisticians had barely carried out their intention of demanding the dismissal of the spy (Antonovich) who was in their midst, when the administration dismissed the manager of the statistical bureau and this again led to the resignation of all the statisticians.

The excitement caused by these events among the mass of statistical department employees can be judged by the letter, written by the Viatka statisticians, in which they state their reasons for refusing to join the movement, and for which they were justly described in *Iskra* [No. 9], as the "Viatka blacklegs."

Iskra, of course, reported only a few of the conflicts which took place and were reported in the legal press. For example, in the provinces of St. Petersburg, Olenets, Nizhni Novgorod, Taurida and Samara (cases in which a number of statisticians are dismissed simultaneously we include in the category of conflict because these cases roused considerable discontent and ferment). The lengths to which the suspicious provincial authorities went can be judged from the following:

S. M. Bleklov, manager of the Taurida bureau, in his *Report on the Investigation of the Dnieprovsk County During May and June, 1901,* which he submitted to the administration, relates that work in this county was carried on under hitherto unprecedented conditions. Notwithstanding the fact that the provincial governor had given his consent to their undertaking these duties, that they were furnished with the necessary documents, and in accordance with the orders of the provincial officials were entitled to the assistance of the local authorities, the investigators *were surrounded with extreme suspicion* on the part of the county police who *followed on their heels* and expressed their distrust of them *in the rudest manner,* so much so that, as a peasant related, a police constable followed in the wake of the statisticians and questioned the peasantry as to whether "the statisticians were not carrying on propaganda in favour of pernicious ideas against the state and the fatherland." According to Mr. Bleklov, the statisticians "encountered various obstacles and difficulties which not only hindered their work, but very profoundly outraged *their sense of personal dignity.* Frequently the statisticians found themselves, as it were, *in the position of persons charged with a crime* and in the position of persons concerning whom secret investigations are made which, by the by, were known to all, and against whom it is considered necessary to warn every one. The moral depression which they frequently suffered can therefore be very well understood.

Not a bad contribution to the history of agrarian statistical conflicts, and the description of the surveillance which is maintained over the "third element," is it?

No wonder the reactionary press rushed in to attack the "rebels." The *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* published a leading article, entitled "The Strike of the Zemstvo Statisticians," in its issue No. 263, of September 24, breathing thunder and lightning, and a special article by N. A. Znamensky, entitled "The Third Element," in its issue No. 279, of October 10. "The third element is raising its head too high," writes the author of the last-mentioned article. It is resorting to "systematic opposition and strikes," in order to resist the attempts to introduce "necessary discipline in the service." The blame for all this rests upon the Zemstvo Liberals who have demoralised the employees.

"There is not the slightest doubt that measures have been taken to introduce a certain amount of order in statistical work by the more sober and sensible of the members of the Zemstvo, who refused to permit the departments in their charge *to be demoralised by anybody, even pretending to play at liberal opposition.* The opposition *and the strikes* should at last open their eyes to the character of the people they have to deal with in the persons of the *intellectual proletarians, who roam from one province to another,* at one time for the purpose of engaging in statistical investigations, at another *for the purpose of educating the local youth in a social and democratic spirit.*

"At all events, the 'Zemstvo statistical conflicts' will teach a useful lesson to the more sensible section of the Zemstvo members. We think they will now see clearly that in the person of the *third element,* they have warmed a snake in the bosom of the Zemstvo institutions." [*Moskovskiye Vyedomosti,* No. 263].

We, too, have no doubt that the wailing and groaning of the faithful watchdogs of the autocracy (this, as is well-known, is the appellation which Katkov, who for so long inspired the *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti,* assumed for himself) will "open the eyes" of many who do not yet fully understand how irreconcilable autocracy is to the interests of social development, to the interests of the intellectuals generally, and to the interests of every genuine public cause, which does not stand for embezzling state funds and treachery.

This little picture of the "anti-third element" crusade, and of the "Zemstvo statistical conflicts," should teach us Social-Democrats an important lesson. It must strengthen our faith in the power of the labour movement we lead, for we see that the state of excitement prevailing in the foremost revolutionary class is spreading to other classes and other strata of society, that it has already led not only to the revolutionary spirit being roused among the students to a degree hitherto unparallelled,* but also to the beginning of the

* At the very moment these lines are being written, news comes of fresh and increased ferment among the students, of meetings being held in Kiev, St. Petersburg, and other towns, of the formation of revolutionary students' groups in Odessa, etc. Perhaps history will impose upon the students the rôle of outposts in the decisive battle. Be that as it may, if victory is to be achieved in this battle, the masses of the proletariat must be roused and we must exert still greater efforts to make them class conscious, to inspire them and organise them.

awakening of the countryside, to greater self-confidence and readiness to fight among social groups which up till now have not been (as groups) very responsive.

Public excitement is growing among the whole people in Russia, among all classes, and it is our duty as revolutionary Social-Democrats, to exert every effort to take advantage of this, in order to explain to the progressive working-class intellectuals that the peasants, the students and the intellectuals generally can serve as their allies, and to teach them how to take advantage of the flashes of protest that break out first in one place and then in another. We shall be able to play the part of front-rank fighters for liberty only when the working class, led by a militant revolutionary party—while never a moment forgetting the special place it occupies in modern society, and its special world historical mission to liberate humanity from economic slavery—will raise the banner in the struggle *for liberty* for the whole of the people, and will rally to this banner all those of the most varied social strata whom the Messrs. Sipyagins, Kondoidis and all of that gang are so zealously forcing into the ranks of the discontented.

All that we need do to enable us to achieve this is to adopt in our movement, not only the inflexible revolutionary theory worked out in the course of a century-old development of European thought, but also the revolutionary energy and revolutionary experience bequeathed to us by our Western European and Russian predecessors, and reject the slavish opportunism in its various forms from which our Western comrades—who have not been affected by it so much—are turning away, but which is such a strong hindrance to us on our march to victory.

The Russian proletariat, at the present time, is confronted by the most difficult, but extremely gratifying tasks: to crush the enemy, whom the long-suffering Russian intelligentsia is unable to overcome, and take its place in the ranks of the international army of Socialism.

IV

TWO SPEECHES BY MARSHALS OF THE NOBILITY

"A FACT, remarkable but sad, that has never before occurred; and many unexampled misfortunes are held in store for Russia by such facts, which are possible only because of the wide inroads

demoralisation has already made in our social life. . . ." So wrote *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, in a leading article in its issue of September 29, No. 268,[129] in commenting on a speech delivered by M. A. Stakhovich, the marshal of the nobility of the province of Oryol, at a missionary congress held in that province (and which closed on September 24). . . . Well, if "social demoralisation" has penetrated the ranks of the marshals of the nobility, the foremost men in the counties and the provinces, where indeed must we seek for the end of this "pestilential, spiritual canker that has seized upon the whole of Russia?"

What is all this wailing about? It is that Mr. Stakhovich (the very gentleman who wished to find jobs for the Oryol nobility as liquor excise collectors; see "Casual Notes," *Zarya*, No. 1,*) who delivered a strong speech in the defence of freedom of conscience, and was "tactless enough, not to say cynical, to suggest the following":

> *It is the duty of the missionary congress more than of any other body in Russia to proclaim the necessity of freedom of conscience*, the necessity to abolish all penalties for seceding from the Orthodox Church and accepting another faith. *And I would suggest that the Oryol missionary congress openly express itself in this sense and petition for this in the most suitable manner. . . .***

Of course, *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* was as naïve to picture Mr. Stakhovich as a Robespierre ("that jovial M. A. Stakhovich, whom I have known for so long, a Robespierre, forsooth!" wrote Mr.

* See p. 76*ff*., Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

** *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, September 29, No. 268. I apologise to the reader for betraying such a predilection for the *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*. But what can one do? In my opinion, it is the most interesting, the most consistent *and the most business-like* political newspaper in Russia. One can hardly call the literature which at best makes a selection of bare, interesting facts, and then reduces its wisdom to sighing and wailing, "political" literature, in the proper sense of the word. I do not say that the latter occupation is not very useful, but it is not politics. Nor can the *Novoye Vremya* type of literature be described as political literature in the real sense of the word, notwithstanding the fact (or because of the fact) that it is excessively political. It has neither a definite political programme nor convictions; it merely possesses the ability to adapt its tone to the moods of the moment, to cringe before the powers that be, carry out everything they order it to do, and to flirt with an apology of a public opinion. The *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, however, has its own line, and is not afraid (it has nothing to be afraid of) to march in advance of the government, and to touch upon, sometimes very frankly, the most delicate subjects. It is a useful newspaper, an indispensable helpmate in revolutionary agitation!

Suvorin in *Novoye Vremya*),[130] and it was as difficult to read his speech "in defence of liberty of conscience" without smiling, as it was naïve on the part of Mr. Stakhovich to suggest to the priests that they petition "in the most suitable manner" for liberty of conscience. It was like suggesting to a county police conference to petition for political liberty!

There is hardly need to add that "the convocation of the clergy, presided over by the archbishop" rejected Mr. Stakhovich's suggestion "on principle," and also for the reason that it did not correspond with the tasks of a local missionary congress after hearing the "weighty objections" of His Grace, the Bishop Nikanor of Oryol, of N. I. Ivanovsky, Professor of the Kazan Academy of Divinity, of V. M. Skvortsov, editor and publisher of the *Missionary Observer*,[131] of V. A. Ternavtsev, and M. A. Novossyolov, candidates of the university and several other missionary priests. One might say: An alliance of "science" and the church!

Of course, Mr. Stakhovich does not interest us as an example of a man having clear and consistent political views, but as an example of the "jovial" Russian petty noble, who is always ready to snatch a piece of the state pie. And one can imagine to what extent "demoralisation" has penetrated Russian life generally and the life of our rural districts in particular as the result of police tyranny and the inquisitorial persecution of religious sects if the very stones cry out, if even a marshal of the nobility talks strongly about liberty of conscience!

The following is a passage from Mr. Stakhovich's speech, which gives a striking picture of the outrageous state of affairs that rouses even the most "jovial" to indignation:

> Go to the missionary library of the brotherhood, and take down the handbook of laws. There you will read in Article 783, Volume II, Part I, that it is the duty of the rural constable, in addition to preventing duelling, lampooning, drunkenness, hunting in the close season, and mixed bathing in public baths to keep observation over the arguments directed against the dogmas of the Orthodox Church, and the conversion of the orthodox to other faiths and schisms!

Yes! There is actually such an article in the Act, and it imposes many more functions upon the rural constable besides those enumerated by the speaker. The majority of city dwellers would look upon this article as a curiosity as Mr. Stakhovich described it, but for the muzhik, this curiosity conceals a *bitterer Ernst*, the bitter

truth about the outrages committed by the lower ranks of the police, who are very well aware that God is very high up and the Tsar is far away.*

Here are some concrete examples which we reproduce together with the official denials made by the President of the Council of the Oryol Orthodox Brotherhood of Peter and Paul and of the Oryol Diocesan Missionary Congress, Bishop Peter Rozhdestvensky [*Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, No. 269, reprinted from the Oryol *Vestnik*, No. 257].[132]

(*a*) In the speech (delivered by Mr. Stakhovich) reference is made to a village in the county of Trubchev:

With the knowledge and consent of the priest and of the officials, the suspected Stundists [A religious sect persecuted by the Orthodox Church and by the tsarist government.—*Ed.*] *were locked in the church.* A table was brought and covered with a white cloth and upon it an ikon was placed. Each one was brought out separately and ordered: "Bow down!"

"I refuse to bow to idols."

"Ah! *Flog him immediately!*"

The weaker ones returned to the orthodox faith after the first flogging. But there were some who were *flogged four times.*

According to the official report the Oryol Orthodox Brotherhood of Peter and Paul, which was published already in 1896, and according to the verbal statement made at the congress by Father D. Pereverzev, the punishment inflicted by the orthodox population upon the sectarians of the village of Lubets in the county of Trubchev took place, *following a decision passed at the village meeting: the flogging took place somewhere in the village and certainly not with the consent of the local priest and not in the church;* and this sad incident took place *eighteen or nineteen years ago,* long before the Oryol Diocesan Mission was established.

Commenting on the above, *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* states that Mr. Stakhovich quoted *only two facts* in his speech. Perhaps so. But what facts were they! A refutation based on "official reports" (of the rural police) and on the report of the Orthodox Brotherhood *merely serves to confirm the report of the outrage* which rouses the indignation of even a joyful noble. The question as to whether the flogging took place "somewhere in the village" or in the church, half a year ago or eighteen years ago does not alter the case in the least (except perhaps in one thing: it is universally known that the persecution of sectarians has become even more brutal lately, and the establishment of missions has a direct connection with this fact!).

* A Russian proverb.—*Ed.*

The bishop's statement in the press that the local priest kept aloof from these *rustic inquisitors* * is only fit for ridicule. Of course, the "local priest" did not give his "consent" to a punishable act any more than the Holy Inquisition inflicted torture on its victims with its own hands. It handed them over to the secular authorities. Nor did it ever shed blood; it only burned its victims.

The second fact:

(*b*) It was stated in the speech:

"Only in that case we shall never hear the priest blab as he did here: '*You say, Father, there were forty families and now there are only four.* What has become of the rest?'

"'By the grace of God *they have been banished to Transcaucasia and Siberia.*'"

As a matter of fact, in the village of Glybochka, in the county of Trubchev, which is the village concerned in this case, there were *in 1898,* according to the report of the Brotherhood, *not forty Stundist families but forty persons* of both sexes, including twenty-one children, and only seven persons were banished to Transcaucasia by the order of the regional court in that year as a penalty for proselytising other people to the Stundist faith. As for the phrase "*by the grace of God banished,*" employed by the local priest, *it was a casual remark dropped at a private session of the congress at a moment when a free exchange of opinion was going on among the members of the congress.* Moreover, the priest in question was previously known to every one, and at the congress proved himself to be *a most worthy* missionary priest.

Such a refutation is positively unexampled. Casually dropped at a moment when a free exchange of opinions was going on. This is precisely what makes it interesting, for we know only too well the real value of the official utterances of official persons. And if the words came "straight from the heart" of the priest—"a most worthy missionary priest"—the more remarkable are they for that reason. "By the grace of God, banished to Transcaucasia and Siberia." These magnificent words should become no less famous than Metropolitan Philaret's defence of serfdom based on the holy scriptures.

Since we have mentioned Philaret, it would be unfair not to mention the letter addressed by a "learned liberal" to his Grace Am-

* In his reply to the official denial, Mr. Stakhovich said: "I do not know what is in the official report of the Brotherhood, but Father Pereverzev related the details of this incident at the congress and stated that the civil authorities knew about it [*sic!!!*]. In reply to the question I, myself, put to him: "Did the priest know?" He answered, "Yes, he too knew." Comment is superfluous.

brosius, archbishop of Kharkov,[133] and published in the magazine *Vera i Razum* [*Faith and Reason*] for 1901.* The author of the letter signed himself: Jeronim Preobrazhensky, honorary citizen, formerly member of the clergy. It was the editor who described him as the "learned [!] liberal," no doubt because he was overawed by the "profundity of his wisdom." We shall reproduce only a few passages from this letter, which again reveal the fact that political thought and political protest penetrates by unseen ways into wider circles than we sometimes imagine.

I am already an old man, nearly sixty years of age. During my lifetime I have observed not a few departures from the fulfilment of church duties, and I must say conscientiously that in every case the clergy were to blame. As for *latest events*, I think we should fervently thank our contemporary clergy for opening the eyes of many. Now, not only volost clerks, but young and old, educated and uneducated and even those barely able to read will strive to read the writings of the great Russian author.[134] People pay high prices to get his books (published abroad by *Svobodnoye Slovo*—[Free Word Publishing Co.];[135] they circulate freely in all countries of the world except Russia); they read them, discuss them and finally come to conclusions that are, of course, not favourable to the clergy. The masses of the people are now beginning to understand where the truth and where falsehood lie; they see that the clergy say one thing and do another, and that often even their words are contradictory. Much that is true might be said but unfortunately one cannot speak frankly with the clergy; they would immediately report to the authorities and demand punishment and execution. . . . Christ did not attract converts by force and executions, but by justice and love. . . .

. . . Concluding your speech, you said: "We possess a great force for the fight—that is the autocratic power of our most devout sovereign." Again a subterfuge, and again we refuse to believe you. Although you, the *enlightened* clergy, strive to assure us that you were "loyal to the autocratic sovereign from the time we were sucklings at our mothers' breasts" (from the speech of the present vicar, delivered at the time of his consecration as bishop), we, the *unenlightened*, refuse to believe that a year-old infant (even a future bishop) could reason about the form of government, and give preference to autocracy. After the abortive attempt of Patriarch Nikon to play in Russia the rôle of the Pope of Rome, who in Western countries combined within himself spiritual and temporal power, our church, represented by its metropolitans, has wholly and forever subjected itself to the power of the sovereign who sometimes, as was the case with Peter the Great, despotically imposed his will upon the church. (The pressure brought to bear upon the clergy by Peter the Great to express their condemnation of the tsarevich Alexei.) In the nineteenth century, we see complete harmony between the secular and ecclesiastical authorities in Russia. In the stern epoch of Nicholas I, when, influenced by

* We take this opportunity to thank the correspondent who sent us the clippings from this magazine. Our governing classes very often are not ashamed to expose themselves *au naturel* in prison, church and similar special publications. It is high time we revolutionists systematically utilised this "rich treasure-house" of political enlightenment.

the great social movements in the West, public conscience began to awaken in Russia, and here too individual champions arose to fight against the outrageous enslavement of the common people, our church remained completely indifferent to the people's sufferings, and in spite of Christ's great gospel of human brotherhood and brotherly love, not a single voice was raised among the clergy in defence of the dispossessed people, against the cruel tyranny of the landlords, and the only reason for this was that the government did not yet dare to lay its hand upon serfdom, the existence of which Philaret of Moscow openly justified by texts from the Holy Scriptures from the Old Testament. And then the storm came: Russia was defeated and politically degraded at Sebastopol. The defeat clearly exposed all the defects of our pre-reform system and our young, humane sovereign (who owes the education of his mind and spirit to the poet Zhukovsky) broke the ancient chains of slavery. By the irony of fate, the text of the great act of February 19 was submitted to be revised from the Christian point of view of Philaret himself, who apparently hastened to change his views regarding serfdom to suit the spirit of the times. The epoch of the great reforms left its mark even upon our clergy, and under Makarius (afterwards Metropolitan) carried on fruitful work of reorganising our ecclesiastical institutions into which they hacked an aperture (if a small one) for the penetration of light and publicity. The period of reaction, which commenced after March 1, 1881, enabled corresponding elements suitable to the tastes of Pobyedonostsev and Katkov to penetrate among the clergy, and while progressive people in the country, in the Zemstvo and in society, are presenting petitions for the abolition of the survivals of corporal punishment, the church remains silent and utters not a word in condemnation of those who advocate flogging—that atrocious instrument for the degradation of human beings made in the image of God. After all this, would it be unjust to suppose *in the event of changes in the régime being brought about from above, that our clergy,* through its representatives would praise a constitutional monarch just as they now praise the autocratic monarch? That being so, why this hypocrisy? Strength lies, then, not in the autocrat, but in the monarch. Peter I was also a heaven-sent autocrat, but the church to this day does not favour him. And Peter III was a similar autocrat who set to work to shear and educate our clergy—what a pity he was not allowed to reign for two or three years! And if the present reigning autocrat, Nicholas II, decided to express his affection for the famous Lyev Nikolayevich,* where would you run to hide with your snares, fears and threats?

In vain do you quote texts from the prayers which the clergy send up for the Tsar—they are a mere jumble of words which convince nobody. We are under an autocracy: if a corresponding order will be issued, you will write prayers twice as long and more expressive.

The second marshal's speech, as far as we know, was not published in our press. A hectographed copy of it was sent to us by an unknown correspondent last August and bore the following inscription in pencil: "Speech delivered by a county marshal of the nobility at a private meeting of marshals called to discuss student affairs." [136] We reproduce the speech in full:

* Leo Tolstoy.—*Ed.*

Owing to shortness of time I shall express my views on the subject this meeting of marshals of the nobility has been called to discuss, in the form of theses:

The cause of the present disorders are approximately known: They are called forth firstly, by the disordered state of the whole of our government system, by the oligarchic administration of the bureaucratic corporation, *i. e.*, by the dictatorship of the bureaucracy.

This state of disorder in the bureaucratic governmental dictatorship reveals itself throughout the whole of Russian society, from top to bottom in the form of general discontent which finds its outward expression in political scheming, which is not temporary or superficial, but profound and chronic.

This political scheming, the common disease of the whole of society, penetrates all its activities, administration and institutions and for that reason necessarily penetrates the educational institutions, and their younger and for that reason more impressionable inhabitants who, too, are oppressed by the régime of the bureaucratic dictatorship.

While recognising that the root of the evil of student disorders lies in the general state of disorder in the government, and in the main is called forth by this state of affairs, by this disease, nevertheless, in view of immediately prevailing sentiments, and in view of the necessity to retard the development of the local evil, these disorders cannot be ignored and efforts must be made at least from this side to diminish their frightfully destructive manifestations, just as when the whole organism is diseased and requiring prolonged and radical treatment, it is necessary to take urgent measures, to prevent local, acute and destructive complications of the disease.

In the secondary and higher educational establishments, the evil of the bureaucratic régime finds expression principally in the substitution of human (youthful) development and education by bureaucratic training, which is combined with the systematic suppression of human individuality and dignity.

Distrust, indignation and anger against the officials and the teachers roused among the youth by all this is being transferred from the high schools to the universities where, unfortunately, the youth encounter the same evils and the same suppression of human individuality and dignity.

In a word, for the youth, the universities are not temples of learning, but factories for converting the impersonal student masses into bureaucratic commodities required by the state.

This suppression of human individuality (in the process of converting the students into an impersonal mass), revealing itself in the form of a systematic and chronic suppression and persecution of all personality and dignity, and frequently in the form of brutal violence, lies at the base of all student disorders which have gone on for several decades, and which threaten to continue with greater intensity in the future, and carry off the best of the youth of Russia.

All this we know—but what are we to do in the present situation? How can we help the present acute situation with all its anger, its misfortunes and sorrow? Throw up our hands and do nothing? Abandon our youth to fate, to the bureaucrats and to the police, without attempting to help them, to wash our hands of the whole thing? This, to my mind, is the main question, *i. e.*, what can we do to assuage the acute symptoms of the disease, even if we recognise its general character?

Our meeting reminds me of a crowd of well-intentioned people who have wandered into a wild forest for the purpose of clearing it, and who stand in helpless amazement at the enormity of the general task, instead of concentrating on one special point.

Professor K. T. has presented to us a striking, general picture of the present state of affairs in the universities and among the students, and he has told us of the effects various external pernicious influences, not only political but even police influences, have upon the shattered stability of the students; but we knew all this before, more or less, although not so clearly as we do now.

He suggested a radical change in the whole of the educational system, and its substitution by a better system as the only possible measure to adopt; but he remarked that this would require considerable time; and if we bear in mind that every separate system in the Russian state, as in every other state, forms an organic part of the system as a whole, then perhaps that time will be eternity.

But what must we do now in order to at least assuage the unbearable pain caused by the disease at the present time? What palliative measures can we adopt? Even palliatives that temporarily soothe the patient are frequently recognised to be necessary. To this question, the professor did not reply. Instead of a reply, we heard vague, hesitating suggestions about the students in general, which, to my mind, obscure the question more than ever. It is even difficult to recall these suggestions, but I shall try to do so.

Something was said about girl students: "There you are. We give them courses and lectures, and see how they thank us—by taking part in student disorders!"

Now, if it were bouquets or costly ornaments that we presented to the fair sex, this reproach would be understandable; but to organise lecture courses for women is not a favour, but the satisfaction of a public need. Women's lecture courses are not a caprice but as much a publicly necessary educational institution as are the universities for the higher development of the youth of both sexes. That is why complete public and comradely solidarity exists between the male and female educational institutions.

In my opinion, this solidarity fully explains also the fact that the unrest among the youth has spread among the students in women's educational institutions. All the students are in a state of unrest, irrespective of the kind of clothing they wear, male or female.

Then some one else spoke about the unrest among the students, and said that we must not be indulgent with the students, that their outrages must be stopped by force. To this, in my opinion, the quite reasonable objection was made that even if the conduct of the students is outrageous, it is not accidental but chronic and due to profound causes, and for that reason they will not submit to mere punitive measures as has been proved by past experience. In my own personal opinion, it is a big question as to which side is responsible for the principal outrage of all the outrageous disorders which excite our educational institutions and are bringing them to their doom. I do not believe the government's reports.

And that is the very point. The other side is not heard and cannot be heard. It is gagged (to-day, the justice of my words, that the administration in its reports prevaricates and that by its atrocious conduct is principally responsible for the outrages, has been entirely confirmed).

Reference was made to the outside influences brought to bear upon the student youth by various revolutionary forces.

Yes, that influence exists, but too much significance is attached to it: The factory owners, in whose factories this influence is mainly felt, also throw the blame for everything upon it, and argue that if it were not for that influence, there would be peace and contentment in their factories, while they forget or ignore the legal and illegal exploitation of the workers, which by dispossessing them, rouses discontent amongst them and leads to disorders.

Were it not for this exploitation, the revolutionary external elements would be deprived of the numerous pretexts and causes which enable them to penetrate so easily into factory affairs. All this, in my opinion, may be said in regard to our educational institutions, which have been transformed from temples of learning into factories for the manufacture of bureaucratic material.

The strength of the small but intelligent handful of young men and women, to whom the professor referred, and their ability to hypnotise and incite whole crowds of young men and women apparently not in the least predisposed that way, to strikes and disorders, lies in the general, instinctive consciousness of the oppression that hovers over the whole of our student youth, and in the generally unhealthy state of mind that is created by this oppression. This is what happens in all factories!

I recall also that something was said about not encouraging the students, not showing them sympathy during disorders, because, it was said, expressions of sympathy merely incite them to fresh outbreaks, and a number of examples were quoted to illustrate this. On this point I would say, first of all, that in view of the enormous variety and the confusion of events that occur during disorders, it is impossible to point to any one particular occurrence as illustrative of them all because, for every case, numerous others of a directly opposite character can be found. All that one can do is to take the general symptoms, which I shall do, and briefly try to examine.

As we all know, the students are far from being spoiled. Not only were they not flattered (I do not speak of the forties) but they never enjoyed any particular public sympathy. At the time of the disorders, the public was either indifferent to the students, or something more than hostile to them. All the blame was thrown entirely upon them, and no one knew or cared to learn the causes which gave rise to the disorders (credence was given, without the slightest doubt as to their veracity, to the government reports, which were hostile to the students; I think now for the first time the public has begun to doubt them). So that to speak of encouraging the students is quite beside the mark.

Failing to find support among the intellectual public or among the professors and the university officials, the students finally began to seek sympathy among various elements of the people, and we know that they succeeded more or less in finding it; they have begun gradually to receive the sympathy of the crowd.

To be convinced of this one need only note the difference in the attitude of the crowd towards the students at the time of the beating up on the Okhotny Ryad,* to what it is now. Herein lies the misfortune: the misfortune is not that sympathy is expressed but that this sympathy is one-sided, that it is assuming a demagogic tinge.

The absence of sympathy and support on the part of the level-headed intellectuals, and the distrust that this gives rise to, throws our youth willy-nilly into the arms of demagogues and revolutionists, and causes them to become their instruments. They too, willy-nilly, begin more and more to develop demagogic elements which separate them from peaceful, cultural development and from the existing order (if it can be called order) and carries them into the enemy's camp.

We ourselves are to blame if our youth have ceased to have confidence in us; we have done nothing to deserve their confidence!

* Hunters' Row. A square in Moscow, adjacent to the Moscow University, where game and poultry were sold.—*Ed.*

These, I think, are the main ideas that were expressed at this meeting; the others (and of these there were not a few) are hardly worth recalling.

And so I conclude. In gathering here, our intention was to do something to assuage the passions of the present day, to lighten the heavy burden of our youth—to-day and not some time in the future. We were defeated and again the youth will be right in saying and will say that the peaceful, level-headed Russian intelligentsia cannot, nor does it wish to, render them any assistance, to come out in their defence, to understand them and to ease their bitter fate. The gulf between ourselves and the youth will become wider, and they will depart from us still more into the ranks of the demagogues who are stretching out their hands towards them.

We were not defeated by the fact that the measure we proposed in our petition to the Tsar was not accepted; perhaps that measure was not a practical one (although in my opinion no attention was paid to it), we were defeated by the fact that we ourselves destroyed all possibility of applying any measure whatsoever to help our suffering youth, we have confessed our impotence, and once again we remained as before, in darkness.

What must we do then?

Wash our hands of the affair and ignore it?

Herein lies the terrible and gloomy tragedy of Russian life.

This speech does not require much comment. It too, apparently, belongs to a still sufficiently "joyful" Russian noble who, either for doctrinaire or for selfish motives, expresses reverence for "peaceful, cultural development" and the "existing order," waxes indignant with "revolutionists" and confuses them with "demagogues." But this indignation, if examined closely, borders on the grumbling of an old man (old, not in age but in views), who perhaps is ready to recognise something good in the thing he is grumbling about. In speaking of the "existing order" he cannot refrain from remarking: "If it can be called order." He is bursting with anger against the disorder caused by the "dictatorship of the bureaucrats," the "systematic and chronic persecution of all personality and dignity," he cannot help seeing that all the outrages are committed principally by the administration. He is sufficiently straightforward to confess his impotence, and to recognise the indecency of "washing one's hands" of the whole country's misfortune. It is true that he is still scared by the "one-sided" sympathy of the "mob" towards the students. His aristocratically tender mind is haunted by the menace of "demagogy," and perhaps even by the menace of Socialism (we shall repay straightforwardness with straightforwardness!). But it would be absurd to attempt to test the views and sentiments of a marshal of the nobility driven to desperation by the disgusting Russian bureaucracy, by the touchstone of Socialism. We shall not beat about the bush with him or with any one else: when we hear a Rus-

sian landowner, for example, loudly condemning the illegal exploitation and the impoverishment of *factory* workers, we shall unfailingly and parenthetically say to him: "Take the beam out of your own eye, friend!" We shall not for a momcnt conceal from him that we stand and shall continue to stand for the irreconcilable class struggle against the "masters" of modern society. But a political attitude is defined not only by ultimate aims, but also by immediate aims, not only by general views but also by the pressure of direct practical necessity. Every one who clearly sees the contradiction between the "cultural development" of the country and the "oppressive régime of the bureaucratic dictatorship," must, sooner or later, be compelled by the very facts of life to come to the conclusion that this contradiction cannot be removed unless the autocracy is removed. Having come to this conclusion he will unfailingly assist—grumble, but assist—the party that can rouse a menacing force against the autocracy—a force that will be menacing, not only in the eyes of the autocracy, but also in the eyes of all. In order to become such a party, we repeat, Social-Democracy must purge itself of all opportunistic pollution, and under the banner of revolutionary theory, and relying upon the most revolutionary class, it must carry its agitation and organising activity among all classes of the population.

And taking our leave of the marshals of the nobility, we will say *au revoir*, gentlemen, our allies of to-morrow! [137]

Written between the end of October and the beginning of November, 1901. First published in *Zarya*, Nos. 2-3, December, 1901, and signed: T. Kh.

PREFACE TO THE PAMPHLET *DOCUMENTS OF THE "UNITY" CONGRESS*[138]

WE have already related in *Iskra* [No. 9, October, 1901],* the unsuccessful attempt to unite the foreign sections of the *Zarya* and *Iskra* organisations, the revolutionary organisation Social-Democrat and the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad. We have decided to publish the minutes of the proceedings of the "Unity" Congress in order that all Russian Social-Democrats may independently draw their own conclusions as to the cause of the failure of these attempts at unity. Unfortunately, the secretary of the congress, who was selected by the League, refused to assist in drawing up the minutes of the congress (as will be seen from his letter in reply to the invitation sent to him by the secretaries of the two other organisations, which we quote on pages 10 and 11 of this pamphlet).

This refusal is all the more strange for the reason that the League has published its own story of the "Unity" Congress. [*Two Congresses,* Geneva, 1901.] It would appear, therefore, that although the League desired to inform Russian comrades of the results of the congress, *it did not desire* to acquaint them with the discussions that took place at it.** We leave it to the reader himself to draw his own conclusions as to the possible and probable reasons for this unwillingness.

After the League had rejected our proposal, we on our part did not think it desirable to publish a summary of the discussion that had not been drawn up jointly by all three secretaries, and for that reason we are obliged to limit ourselves to the publication *of all the documents and declarations submitted to the bureau* of the congress. The bureau of the congress consisted of the chairmen and

* See p. 300, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

** According to the standing orders of the congress, the minutes should have been confirmed by the congress itself. Each day's proceedings should have commenced with the reading and confirmation of the minutes of the previous day's proceedings. But on the second day of the congress, when the chairman, in opening the session, called for the minutes of the two first sessions of the first day, the three secretaries in one voice declared that they could not present them. Owing to the absence of a stenographer, the records were in a completely unsatisfactory state. It is quite understandable, therefore, that if the secretaries could not prepare the minutes on the night after

secretaries of all three organisations, and all declarations were submitted to the bureau in writing, so that there can be no doubt about the impartiality of a description of the congress which is based on documents and declarations.

On the other hand, the publication of *all* the documents and declarations submitted to the bureau is all the more necessary at the present time for the reason that the League has crowned its strange refusal to take part in drawing up the minutes of the congress by a more than strange method of drawing up the report of the congress. For example, the League has *not reproduced* in full the questions * submitted to the *bureau* of the congress by the representative of *Iskra* (Frey) in the name of the foreign section of *Iskra*, and of the Social-Democrat organisation, but it did reproduce the reply to these questions that were only "drawn up" by the League and were not submitted to the bureau, and not even read at the congress [*Two Congresses*, p. 26]. The League is mistaken when it says that the "*interpolation*" was withdrawn. The interpellation consisted of two questions submitted to the League by Frey in the name of the two organisations (*See* p. 6 of the present pamphlet). *Neither* of these questions *were withdrawn*, only the form of the questions was changed into the form of a resolution which might have been submitted to a vote (the words "does the League recognise in principle the resolutions of the June conference?" were altered to read: "The three organisations recognise in principle the resolutions of the June conference," etc.). The League has not reproduced the declaration of the Borba [Struggle] group *which was submitted to the bureau* (*See* pp. 6-7 of this pamphlet).

Not only has the League failed to publish a summary of the speech delivered by a member of the Borba group after the League had submitted amendments to the June resolutions, but it makes no reference whatever to the speech [*Two Congresses*, p. 28]. In that

the first day of the congress, it was useless to expect that the minutes would be ready on the evening of the second day when we left the congress. Every one knew perfectly well that the minutes were not ready. Consequently, the League's indignation over the "desertion" of our chairman, who "did not wait until the minutes of the congress were confirmed" [*Two Congresses*, p. 29], is nothing but a subterfuge. Since there was no stenographic report, there was nothing else to do except for the secretaries to get together, and draw up a brief summary of the discussion. This is in fact what we proposed, but the League rejected this. Clearly, the responsibility for the absence of a summarised, if not a full report of the congress, rests upon the League.

* See p. 290, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

speech, the member of the Borba group, who had taken part in the June conference, spoke against the League's amendments. But the League did publish the "arguments" in favour of the amendments contained in a speech delivered at the congress by B. Krichevsky, but which were not submitted to the bureau. In a word, having rejected our proposal for the joint drafting of a summary of the whole of the discussion, the League preferred to publish only what it thought of advantage to itself, and to ignore some of the things that were even submitted to the bureau.

We do not propose to follow that example. We have confined ourselves to the publication of all the declarations and documents submitted to the bureau, together with a bare statement of the opinions expressed by the spokesmen of *all* the organisations represented at the congress. Let the reader himself judge as to whether the article in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, and the League's *amendments* have violated the principle which was the basis of the agreement drawn up at the June conference. Of course, we shall also leave unanswered the angry words which so profusely decorate the pages of the League's pamphlet, including the charges of "slander," and that we "broke up" the congress by leaving it. Such accusations can only raise a smile. Three organisations gathered together to discuss the question of unity. Two organisations agreed that they could unite, the third could not. Naturally, there was nothing left for the two organisations to do but to explain their position and depart. Only those who are angry because they are wrong can describe this as "breaking up" the congress, and describe the opinion expressed that the League is shaky in its principles as "slander."

As for our opinion regarding the controversial questions concerning Russian Social-Democracy, we prefer not to confuse it with an objective report of the proceedings of the congress. In addition to the articles which have already appeared and will appear in future numbers of *Iskra* and *Zarya*, we shall in the near future, publish a special pamphlet on the burning questions of our movement.

Written November, 1901. First published in a pamphlet issued by the League, December, 1901.

THE PROTEST OF THE FINNISH PEOPLE

We reproduce below the full text of a mass petition by means of which the Finnish people express their strong protest against the policy of the government, which has infringed, and continues to infringe, on the constitution of Finland, in violation of the oath solemnly taken by all the Tsars from Alexander I to Nicholas II.

The petition was presented on September 30, 1901, in the Finnish Senate, to be submitted to the Tsar. It is signed by 473,363 Finnish men and women of all classes of society, *i. e.*, nearly *half a million* citizens. The total population of Finland is 2,500,000, so that this petition veritably expresses *the voice of the whole of the people.*

The text is as follows:

Most puissant, most gracious sovereign, Emperor and Grand Duke! Your Imperial Majesty's amendments of the Military Service Act of Finland has aroused universal alarm and profound sorrow throughout the whole of the country.

Your Imperial Majesty's confirmation on July 12 this year of the command, manifesto and law of military service is in complete violation of the fundamental laws of the Grand Duchy, and of the precious rights belonging to the Finnish people and to all the citizens of the country provided for in those laws.

According to these fundamental laws, regulations governing citizens' duties to defend the region cannot be issued except with the consent of the Senate. It was in this manner that the Military Service Act of 1878 was passed in accordance with a joint decision of the Emperor Alexander II and the Senate. During the reign of Emperor Alexander III, numerous alterations were made in this act, but not one was made without the agreement of the Senate. Notwithstanding this, the Act of 1878 is declared annulled, without the agreement of the Senate, and the new orders issued in place of the old act are in complete variance with the decision of the Senate of the Special Diet of 1899.

One of the most important rights that belongs to every Finnish citizen is to live and labour under the protection of Finnish laws. To-day, thousands and thousands of Finnish citizens are deprived of this right, for the new Military Service Act compels them to serve in the Russian forces, and converts the fulfilment of military obligation into suffering for those sons of our country who will be forcibly drafted into these forces, alien to them in language, religion, habits and customs.

The new regulations abolish every legally fixed determination of the annual contingent. Moreover, they contain no recognition of the right provided in the fundamental laws of the Orders to participate in drawing up the military budget.

In violation of the fundamental principle of the law of 1876, even the

militia has been made entirely dependent upon the discretion of the Minister of War.

The impression created by such regulations are not modified by the measures of relief referred to in the manifesto, which are to operate for a transitional period as yet undefined, because the temporary reduction in the number of recruits will be immediately followed by unlimited drafts for service with the Russian forces.

The Finnish people have not asked for any relief of the military burden they carried. The Orders which express the opinion of the people have proved the readiness of Finland as far as it is in its power to increase its share of the task of protecting the state on the condition that the juridical position of the Finnish troops as a Finnish institution is preserved.

Contrary to this, the new regulations abolish the majority of the units of the Finnish troops, and permit Russian officers to enter the service of the few remaining units. The new regulations even lay it down that the non-commissioned officers of these units must know Russian, and in this way Finnish-born citizens, particularly of the peasant class, will be entirely prevented from filling these posts. It is further laid down that these troops are to come under the control of Russian administration and that they may, even in peace time, be stationed outside of Finland.

The passing of these orders, which are not a reform but merely pursue the aim of abolishing the national troops of Finland, is a sign of distrust which the Finnish people throughout almost a century of union with Russia have done nothing to deserve.

The new military service regulations also contain words, the implication of which is that the Finnish people have not a country of their own and that the rights of Finnish citizenship to those who are born in the country are denied. These words betray aims which are incompatible with the inalienable right of the Finnish people to preserve, in their union with Russia, the political position which was firmly guaranteed to Finland in 1809.

Great misfortune has beset our region during the past few years. Time after time, it has been demonstrated that the established fundamental laws of the region are ignored, partly in legislative measures and partly in the filling of vacancies for important posts by Russians. The region has been administered in a manner to suggest that the aim was to disturb peace and order, to hinder useful pursuits and to cause friction between Russians and Finns.

The greatest misfortune that has befallen the country, however, is the introduction of the military service regulations.

In its humble petition of May 27, 1899, the Senate described in detail the order which, according to the fundamental laws of Finland, must be observed in passing the Military Service Act. In this petition they pointed out that if the new Military Service Act will be passed in any other manner, that act, even if put into operation by force, cannot be recognised as a legal measure, and in the eyes of the Finnish people will be nothing more than an act of violence.

All that the Orders pointed out continues to remain the unshakable conviction of the Finnish people, which cannot be changed by violence.

Severe consequences are to be feared from regulations passed contrary to the laws of the country. The conscience of officials in government institutions will come into grave conflict with their sense of duty, for their conscience will urge them to refuse to be guided by such regulations. The number of able-bodied settlers who are compelled to leave the country out of fear of the threatening changes will increase still more if the regulations announced will be put into operation.

The new military service regulations, like every other measure directed against the rights of the Finnish people to a separate political and national existence, must inevitably sow distrust between the monarch and the people, and also give rise to increasing discontent, to a sense of general oppression, to uncertainty and to enormous difficulties for society and its members in the work for the welfare of the region. These evils cannot be avoided except by substituting the aforesaid regulations by a military service law passed jointly with the Senate, and by the government authorities of the region strictly observing the fundamental laws.

The Finnish people cannot cease to be a separate people. United by their common history, juridical conceptions and cultural work, our people will remain true to their love of their Finnish motherland and to their liberty guaranteed by law. The people will not deviate from their aspirations worthily to occupy the modest place fate has destined for them among the nations.

Firm in the conviction of our rights and in the respect for our laws which are our mainstay in our social life, we are no less firmly convinced that the unity of mighty Russia will suffer no damage if Finland continues in the future to be administered in accordance with the fundamental principles laid down in 1809, and in this way to feel happy and peaceful in its union with Russia.

The sense of duty to their country compels the inhabitants of all communities and classes of society to submit to Your Imperial Majesty a true and unembellished statement of the state of affairs. We pointed out above that the recently promulgated military service regulations, contradicting as they do the solemnly guaranteed fundamental laws of the Grand Duchy, cannot be regarded as a legal act. We consider it our duty to add that the military burden in itself is not nearly so important to the Finnish people as the loss of firmly established rights and of the peace based on law in regard to this most important question. We therefore humbly pray your Imperial Majesty graciously to give the matters referred to in this petition the attention their seriousness calls for. We are,

etc.

We have little to add to the above petition, which represents a people's indictment of the Russian official law-breakers. We shall enumerate the principal facts of the "*Finnish question.*"

Finland was annexed to Russia in 1809, during the war with Sweden. Desiring to win over the Finns, who were formerly subjects of the Swedish king, Alexander I decided to recognise and confirm the old Finnish constitution. According to this constitution, no fundamental law can be made, amended, interpreted or repealed *without the consent of the Diet, i. e., the Assembly of Representatives of all estates.* And Alexander I in a number of manifestoes "solemnly" confirmed "*the promise sacredly to preserve the separate constitution of the country.*"

This sacred promise was subsequently confirmed by all succeeding Russian monarchs including Nicholas II, who, in a manifesto of November 6, 1894 . . . "promised to preserve them [the funda-

mental laws] in their inviolable and immutable force and operation."

In less than five years the Tsar of Russia proved to be a *perjurer.* Preceded by a campaign of vilification conducted by the venal and reptile press the Manifesto of February 15, 1899, was promulgated which introduced new regulations according to which: Laws may be passed, *without the consent of the Diet* "if these laws concern the requirements of the empire as a whole or are part of imperial legislation."

This was a glaring violation of the constitution, a veritable coup d'état, because every law can be said to concern the requirements of the empire as a whole!

This revolution was brought about by *violence*: Governor-General Bobrikov threatened to call troops into Finland if the Senate refused to publish the Manifesto. According to the statements made by Russian officers, ball cartridges were served out to the Russian troops stationed in Finland and horses were saddled and ready, etc.

The first act of violence was followed by innumerable others. Finnish newspapers were suppressed one after another. The right of assembly was annulled. Finland was flooded with swarms of Russian spies and despicable provocateurs, who provoked the people to rebellion. Finally, the Military Service Act of July 12 was passed, *without the consent of the Diet.* This law has been dealt with sufficiently in the petition.

Both the Manifesto of February 15, 1899, and the act of July 12, 1901, are *illegal.* This—the violence of a perjurer, acting with a horde of Bashi-Buzuks—is called the tsarist government. It is useless, of course, for 2,500,000 Finns to think of an uprising, but we, all Russian citizens, should ponder over the shame that falls upon us. We are still such slaves as can be employed to reduce other tribes to slavery. We still tolerate a government which, with the ferocity of an executioner, suppresses every aspiration towards liberty in Russia, and moreover, employs Russian troops for the purpose of violently infringing on the liberties of others!

Iskra, No. 11, November 20, 1901.

A CONVERSATION WITH DEFENDERS OF ECONOMISM

BELOW we publish the full text of a letter we have received from one of our representatives.

To the Editors of Russian Social-Democratic organs:

In response to the suggestion made by our comrades in exile that we express our views concerning *Iskra*, we have resolved to state the reasons for our disagreement with that organ.

While recognising that the appearance of a special Social-Democratic organ especially devoted to questions of the political struggle is quite opportune, we do not think that *Iskra*, which has undertaken this task, has handled it satisfactorily. The principal drawback of the paper, which runs like a thread through all its columns, and which is the cause of all its other large and small defects, is the extreme importance it attaches to the influence the ideologists of the movement exercise upon its various tendencies. At the same time, *Iskra* gives too little consideration to the material elements and the material environment of the movement whose interaction creates a certain type of labour movement and defines its path from which the ideologists, in spite of all their efforts, are incapable of diverting it, even if they are inspired by the best theories and programmes.

This defect becomes most marked when *Iskra* is compared with *Yuzhny Rabochy* [*Southern Worker*] [139] which, like *Iskra*, has raised the banner of the political struggle but which links it up with preceding phases of the South Russian labour movement. *Iskra* never thinks of doing that. Although it has set itself the task of fanning "sparks into a great conflagration," * it forgets that suitable inflammable material and favourable external conditions are required for this. In dissociating itself from the Economists, *Iskra* loses sight of the fact that their activity prepared the ground for the workers to participate in the February and March events, upon which *Iskra* lays so much stress, and apparently greatly exaggerates. While criticising the activity of the Social-Democrats of the nineties, *Iskra* ignores the fact that at that time conditions were lacking for any other work except the struggle for minor demands, and ignores the enormous educational significance this struggle had *Iskra* is absolutely wrong and unhistorical in its appraisement of that period and the direction of the activities of Russian Social-Democrats at that time, and identifies their tactics with the tactics of Zubatov,[140] failing to see the difference between the "struggle for minor demands," which widened and deepened the labour movement, and the "minor concessions," the purpose of which was to paralyse every struggle and every movement.

Thoroughly imbued with the sectarian intolerance so characteristic of ideologists in the infantile period of social movements, *Iskra* is ready to brand every disagreement with it not only as a departure from Social-Democratic principles, but also as desertion to the camp of the enemy. Of such a nature is its extremely indecent and most reprehensible attack upon *Rabochaya Mysl*, contained in the article on Zubatov, in which the latter's success among a certain section of the working class was attributed to that paper.[141] Being

* A play on the word *Iskra*, which means spark.—*Ed.*

in opposition to other Social-Democratic organisations which differ from it in their views concerning the progress and tasks of the Russian labour movement, *Iskra*, in the heat of controversy, sometimes forgets the truth, and clutching at isolated and badly expressed phrases attributes to its opponents views they do not hold, emphasises points of disagreement that are frequently of little material importance, and obstinately ignores numerous points of resemblance in views. We have in mind *Iskra's* attitude towards *Rabocheye Dyelo*.

Iskra's excessive predilection for controversy is due primarily to its exaggerated idea of the rôle of "ideology" (programmes, theories . . .) in the movement, and is partly an echo of the internecine squabbles that have flared up among Russian emigrants in Western Europe, of which they have hastened to inform the world in a number of polemical pamphlets and articles. In our opinion, these disagreements exercise almost no influence upon the actual progress of the Russian Social-Democratic movement, except perhaps to damage it by introducing an undesirable schism among the comrades working in Russia. For that reason, we cannot but express our disapproval of *Iskra's* polemical zeal, particularly when it exceeds the bounds of decency.

This fundamental drawback is the cause of *Iskra's* inconsistency in regard to the question of the relations between Social-Democrats and various social classes and tendencies. By a process of theoretical reasoning *Iskra* arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary immediately to take up the struggle against absolutism, but in all probability, realising the difficulty of this task for the workers in the present state of affairs, and lacking the patience to wait until the working class has accumulated sufficient forces for this struggle, *Iskra* begins to seek for allies in the ranks of the liberals and intellectuals. In this quest, it not infrequently departs from the class point of view, obscures class antagonisms and puts into the forefront the general discontent prevailing against the government, notwithstanding the fact that the causes and the degree of this discontent vary very considerably among the "allies." Such, for example, is *Iskra's* attitude toward the Zemstvo. It tries to fan the Zemstvo's Fronde-like * demonstrations, which are frequently called forth by the fact that the government pays more attention to industry than to the agrarian aspirations of the Zemstvoists, into flames of political struggle, and promises the nobility, who are dissatisfied with the government's doles, the assistance of the working class, without mentioning a word about the antagonism of class interests between these two sections of the population that prevails among the various strata of the population. It may be conceded that the Zemstvo is being roused and that it is an element fighting the government; but this must be stated in a manner so clear and distinct that no doubt can be left as to the character a possible agreement with such elements must bear. *Iskra*, however, deals with the question of our attitude towards the Zemstvo in a way that to our mind can only dim class consciousness, because in this matter, like advocates of liberalism and the various cultural enterprises, it runs counter to the fundamental task of Social-Democratic literature, which is not to obscure class antagonisms but to criticise the bourgeois system and explain the class interests that divide it. Such also is *Iskra's* attitude towards the student movements. And yet, in other articles *Iskra* condemns

* Fronde—the nickname given to the insignificant civil wars in France during the minority of Louis XIV (1648, 1650, 1651) in which the court party was attacked.—*Ed.*

all "compromise" and defends, for example, the intolerant conduct of the Guesdists.[142]

We shall refrain from dwelling upon *Iskra's* minor defects and blunders, but in conclusion we think it our duty to observe that we do not in the least desire by our criticism to belittle the significance which *Iskra* can acquire, nor do we close our eyes to its merits. We welcome it as a political, Social-Democratic newspaper in Russia. We regard one of its greatest merits to be its able explanation of the question of terror to which it devoted a number of timely articles. Finally, we cannot refrain from noting the exemplary, literary style in which *Iskra* is written, which is so rare in illegal publications, its regular appearance, and abundance of fresh and interesting material which it publishes.

COMRADES.

September, 1901.

In the first place, we would like to say in regard to this letter, that we cordially welcome the straightforwardness and frankness of its authors. It is high time to stop playing at hide and seek, concealing one's economic "credo" (as is done by a section of the Odessa Committee from which the "politicians" broke away), or declaring, as if in mockery of the truth, that at the present time "not a single Social-Democratic organisation is guilty of the sin of Economism" [*Two Congresses*, p. 32, published by *Rabocheye Dyelo*]. And now to business.

The authors of the letter make exactly the same mistake that is made by *Rabocheye Dyelo* (*See* particularly No. 10). They are muddled over the question of the relations between the "material" (spontaneous, as *Rabocheye Dyelo* expresses it) elements of the movements and the ideological elements (conscious elements operating "according to plan"). They fail to understand that an "ideologist" is worthy of that name only when he marches *ahead* of the spontaneous movement, points out the road, and when he is able ahead of all others to solve all the theoretical, political, tactical and organisational questions which the "material elements" of the movement spontaneously encounter. In order to give "consideration to the material elements of the movement" it is necessary to be critical of it, to point out its dangers and defects, and aspire to *elevate* spontaneity to consciousness. To say, however, that ideologists (*i. e.*, conscious leaders) cannot divert the movement created by the interaction of environment and elements from its path is to ignore the elementary truth that consciousness *participates* in this interaction and creation. Catholic and monarchist labour unions in Europe are also an inevitable result of the interaction of environment and elements. The difference, however, is that it was the

consciousness of priests and Zubatovs and not that of Socialists that participated in this interaction. The theoretical views of the authors of this letter (like those of *Rabocheye Dyelo*) do not represent Marxism, but the parody of it which is nursed by our "critics" and revisionists who are unable to link up spontaneous evolution with conscious revolutionary activity.

In the circumstances prevailing at the present time this profound theoretical blunder inevitably leads to great political blunders, which have already inflicted and continue to inflict incalculable damage upon Russian Social-Democracy. The point is that the spontaneous awakening of the masses of the workers, and (thanks to their influence) of other social strata, has been taking place with astonishing rapidity during the past few years. The "material elements" of the movement have grown enormously even compared with 1898, but *the conscious leaders* (the Social-Democrats) *lag behind this growth.* This is the principal cause of the crisis which Russian Social-Democracy is now experiencing. The mass (spontaneous) movement lacks "ideologists" sufficiently trained theoretically to be immune against any sort of wavering; it lacks leaders with a broad political outlook, revolutionary energy and organisational talent to create a militant political party on the basis of the new movement.

All this in itself would not be so bad, however. Theoretical knowledge, political experience and organising ability are things that can be acquired. Would that the desire existed to train for and acquire these qualities. But since 1897, and particularly since the autumn of 1898, persons and organs have raised their heads in the Russian Social-Democratic movement, who not only close their eyes to this drawback, but have declared it to be a special virtue. These people have elevated the worship of and servility towards spontaneity into a theory and are preaching that Social-Democrats must not march ahead, but *drag at the tail* of the movement. (These organs not only included *Rabochaya Mysl*, but also *Rabocheye Dyelo*, which commenced with the "stages theory" and ended up with the defence of spontaneity, of the "complete and real equality of the movement," of the "tactics-process," etc.)

Now this was a real misfortune. This meant the rise of a *separate tendency*, which is called Economism (in the broad sense of the word) and the principal feature of which is that it fails to understand the danger of and even *defends straggling, i. e.*, as we have

already explained, the conscious leaders lagging behind the spontaneous awakening of the masses. The characteristic features of this tendency are: In the matter of principles—vulgarisation of Marxism and helplessness in the face of modern "criticism," that latest species of opportunism; in politics—a striving to restrict or to fragmentise political agitation and political struggle, a failure to understand that unless Social-Democrats take the leadership of the general democratic movement in their *own* hands, they will never be able to overthrow the autocracy; in tactics—complete instability (last spring *Rabocheye Dyelo* stood in amazement before the "new" question of terror, and only six months later, after considerable wavering and, as always, dragging at the tail of the movement, did it express itself against terror in a very ambiguous resolution [143]; in regard to organisation—the failure to understand that the mass character of the movement does not diminish but increases our obligation to establish a strong and centralised organisation of revolutionaries capable of leading the preparatory struggle, all ununexpected outbursts and the final decisive attack.

Against this tendency we have conducted an irreconcilable struggle and will continue to do so in the future. Apparently the authors of this letter belong to this tendency. They tell us that the economic struggle prepared the ground for the workers' participation in the demonstrations, but we were the first to appreciate, and appreciated more fully than any one else, the importance of this preparatory work, when, as far back as December, 1900, in our very first issue, we opposed the stages theory,* and when in February in our second issue, immediately after the students were drafted into the army, and before the demonstration took place, we called upon the workers to come to the assistance of the students.** The February and March events did not refute the fears and alarms of the *Iskra* as Martynov —who had displayed a complete failure to understand the question— thinks [*See Rabocheye Dyelo,* No. 10, p. 53], but wholly confirmed them, for the leaders *lagged behind* the spontaneous rise of the masses, and proved to be unprepared for the fulfilment of their duties as leaders. Even at the present time the preparations are far from complete, and for that reason all talk about "exaggerating the rôle of ideology," or the rôle of the conscious element as com-

* See p. 53, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

** See p. 70, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

pared with the spontaneous element, etc., continues to exercise extremely baneful influence upon our party.

Equally harmful is the influence exercised by the talk, alleged to be in defence of the class point-of-view, about laying less stress upon the general discontent of the various classes of the population against the government. On the contrary, we are proud of the fact that *Iskra* rouses political discontent among *all* strata of the population, and the only thing we regret is that we are unable to do this on a much wider scale. It is not true to say that in doing so, we obscure the class point-of-view. The authors have not pointed to a single concrete example in proof of this, nor can they do so. Notwithstanding the opinion expressed in *Rabocheye Dyelo* [No. 10, p. 41], Social-Democracy, as the vanguard in the fight for democracy, must lead the activities of the various oppositional strata, explain to them the general political significance of their partial and industrial conflicts with the government, rally them to the support of revolutionary parties, and must train from its own ranks leaders capable of exercising political influence upon all oppositional strata. Any refusal to take up this rôle, however florid the phrases may be about close, organic contact with the proleterian struggle in which this refusal is clothed, is tantamount to repeating the "defence of straggling," the defence of Social-Democrats lagging behind the nation-wide democratic movement, and tantamount to surrendering the leadership to bourgeois democracy. Let the authors of the letter ponder over the question as to why the events of last spring served so strongly to stimulate *non*-Social-Democratic revolutionary tendencies, instead of raising the authority and prestige of Social-Democracy!

We cannot withhold our protest against the astonishing shortsightedness displayed by the authors of the letter in regard to the controversies and internecine squabbles among the emigrants. They repeat the silly statements about the "indecency" of dealing with *Rabochaya Mysl* in an article devoted to Messrs. Zubatovs. Do they wish to deny that the spreading of Economism facilitates the tasks of the Zubatovs? In asserting this, however, we do not in the least "identify" the tactics of the Economists with the tactics of Zubatov. As for the "emigrants" (if the authors of the letter were not so unpardonably careless concerning the continuity of ideas in the Russian Social-Democratic movement, they would have known that the warnings uttered by the "emigrants," to be precise, by the

Emancipation of Labour group, about Economism have been strikingly confirmed!) [144], note the manner in which Lassalle, who was working among the Rhine workers judged the controversies that raged among the emigrants in London in 1852. Writing to Marx, he said:

> . . . The publication of your work against the "big men," Kinkel, Ruge, etc., should hardly meet with any difficulties on the part of the police. . . . For, in my opinion, the government is not averse to the publication of such works because it thinks that "the revolution will thereby fritter itself away of its own accord." Their bureaucratic logic knows and fears little about the fact that it is precisely internal party struggles that give a party strength and life, that the best proof of the weakness of a party is its diffuseness and its blurring of clear-cut differences, that a party becomes stronger by purging itself. [From a letter by Lassalle to Marx, dated June 24, 1852.] [145]

Let the numerous kind-hearted opponents of severity, irreconcilability and excessive polemical zeal take note!

In conclusion, we shall observe that we were able in these remarks only briefly to touch upon the questions in dispute. We intend to devote a special pamphlet to the analysis of these questions, which we hope will appear in the course of a month or six weeks.

Iskra, No. 12, December 6, 1901.

THE DEMONSTRATIONS HAVE COMMENCED

A FORTNIGHT ago we observed the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first social-revolutionary demonstration in Russia, which took place on December 6, 1876, on the Kazan Square in St. Petersburg, and referred to the enormous increase in the number and magnitude of the demonstrations which took place in the beginning of the present year.[146] We urged that the demonstrators should advance a more definitely political slogan than *Land and Freedom* (1876), and a more far-reaching demand than "Repeal the Provisional Regulations" (1901). The slogan they should advance is, "*political liberty*," and the popular demand they should put forward is "*convene the people's representatives.*"

We see that demonstrations are being revived on the most varied pretexts in Nizhni-Novgorod, in Moscow, and in Kharkov. Public excitement is growing everywhere and the necessity to combine this into a single stream *against the autocracy*, which everywhere sows tyranny, oppression and violence, becomes more and more imperative. On November 7, a small but successful demonstration was held in Nizhni-Novgorod, which was caused by a farewell gathering in honour of Maxim Gorky. An author of European fame whose only weapon was free speech—as a speaker at the Nizhni-Novgorod demonstration aptly put it—is deported by the autocratic government from his home town without trial or investigation. The Bashi-Buzuks accuse him of exercising a pernicious influence on us—said a speaker in the name of all Russians who are the least bit imbued with a striving towards light and liberty—but we declare that his influence was a good one. The gendarmes commit their outrages in secret, and we shall expose their outrages to the light of day. In Russia, workers are beaten up because they demand their right to a better life; students are beaten up for protesting against tyranny. Every honest and bold utterance is suppressed! The demonstration, in which workers took part, was concluded by the students declaiming in chorus: "Tyranny shall fall, and the people shall rise mighty, free and strong!"

In Moscow, hundreds of students waited at the station to greet Gorky. Meanwhile, the police, scared out of their wits, *arrested*

him in his compartment in the middle of the journey and, notwithstanding the permission previously granted him, prohibited him from entering Moscow, and obliged him to change immediately from the Nizhni-Novgorod line to the Kursk line. The demonstration against Gorky's deportation failed, but on the eighteenth, without any preparation, a small demonstration of students and "strangers" (as our Ministers express it) took place in front of the governor-general's house against the prohibition of a social evening arranged on the previous evening to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the death of N. A. Dobrolyubov. The representative of the autocracy in Moscow was howled down by people to whom, as to all educated and thinking Russia, the memory of a writer was dear who passionately hated tyranny, and passionately looked forward to a people's uprising against the "Turks at home," *i. e.*, against the autocratic government. The executive committee of the Moscow students' organisation quite rightly pointed out in their bulletin of December 6 that this unprepared demonstration served as a striking indication of the prevailing discontent and protest.

In Kharkov, a demonstration called in connection with student affairs developed into a regular street battle, in which the students were not alone to participate. Last year's experience taught the students a lesson. They realised that only the support of the people and especially of the workers could guarantee them success, and that in order to obtain that support, they must not restrict themselves to fighting merely for academic (student) liberty, but for *liberty for the whole people,* for *political liberty.* The Kharkov Joint Council of Students' Organisations definitely expressed this idea in their October Manifesto, and judging from their leaflets and manifestoes, the students of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, Riga and Odessa are beginning to understand how "senseless are the dreams" of academic liberty amidst the gloom of enslavement enshrouding the people. The despicable speech delivered by General Vannovsky in Moscow, in which he denied the "rumours" that he at any time promised anything, the unparallelled insolence of the St. Petersburg detective —who seized a student in the Electro-Technical Institute in order to take from him a letter he had received through a messenger, the savage beating up of Yaroslavl students by the police in the streets and in the police station—these and a thousand other facts shout from the housetops as it were, about the struggle, struggle, struggle against the whole of the autocratic system. The last straw was the

case of the Kharkov veterinary surgeons. The first-year students submitted a petition for the dismissal of Professor Lagermark, on account of his bureaucratic attitude towards their studies, and his intolerable rudeness in which he went so far as to throw copies of the curriculum in the faces of the students! Without investigating the case, the government replied by expelling the entire first-year class from the Institute, and in addition slandered the students by declaring in its communication that the latter demanded the right to appoint the professors. This roused all the Kharkov students to their feet, and it was resolved to organise a strike and demonstration. Between November 28 and December 2, Kharkov was for the second time in the same year transformed into a field of battle between the "Turks at home" and the people, who were protesting against autocratic tyranny. On the one side, shouts of: "Down with the autocracy!", "Long live liberty!"—on the other side, sabre thrusts, knouts, and horses trampling upon the people. The police and Cossacks mercilessly beat up all and sundry, irrespective of age and sex. They gained a glorious victory over an unarmed crowd and are now triumphant. . . .

Shall we allow them to triumph?

Workers! You know only too well the adversary that is tormenting the Russian people. This adversary binds you hand and foot in your every-day struggles against the employers for a better life and for human dignity. This adversary snatches hundreds of thousands of your best comrades from your midst, flings them into jail, sends them into banishment and, as if in mockery, declares them to be "persons of evil conduct." This adversary on May 7 shot down the workers of the Obukhov Works in St. Petersburg, who rose up with the cry: "We want liberty!" and he staged the farce of a trial, in order to send those heroes who were not laid low by bullets to penal servitude. This adversary who beats up the students to-day, will fling himself with greater ferocity upon you to-morrow. Lose no time! Remember that you must support every protest and every fight against the Bashi-Buzuks of the autocratic government! Exert every effort to come to an agreement with the demonstrating students. Organise circles for the rapid transmission of information and for the distribution of leaflets. Explain to all and sundry that you will rise to fight for the liberty of the whole of the people.

When the flames of popular indignation and open struggle break

out, now here and now there, it is more than ever necessary to direct a stream of fresh air upon them, in order that these flames may be fanned into a great conflagration!

Iskra, No. 13, January 2, 1902.

THE BUDGET

THE newspapers as usual have published the humble report of the Minister of Finance on the revenues and expenditure of the state for 1902.[147] And, as usual, according to the Minister, everything is in perfect order: "The finances are in a perfectly sound state," "equilibrium is consistently maintained" in the budget, "railway affairs continue to develop successfully"; there is even "a steady improvement in public prosperity"! Notwithstanding their importance, it is not surprising that little interest is taken in public affairs in Russia; interest is dulled by the invariably bureaucratic style in which public documents are phrased; every one thinks to himself: The paper does not mind what is written on it—"it's all the same"; the public is "not permitted" to peep behind the scenes of the official financial sleight-of-hand.

This time, however, certain circumstances are so glaring that one cannot help noticing them. The conjurer, with his usual dexterity, shows the audience his empty hand and then, with a wave, appears to take gold coin after gold coin out of the air. The audience applauds, but the conjurer, nevertheless, begins vehemently to excuse himself, and almost with tears in his eyes assures the audience that there was no trickery, that there really is no deficit in the budget, and that his assets are greater than his liabilities. The Russian public is so well drilled to believe in the decency of the behaviour of those in public office that the audience begins to feel awkward and only a few mutter to themselves the French proverb: "He who excuses himself, accuses himself."

Observe how our Mr. Witte "excuses himself." The enormous expenditure of nearly 2,000,000,000 rubles (1,946,000,000 rubles) is covered in full only because 144,000,000 rubles were taken from the notorious "reserve fund" of the Treasury, while the reserve fund was supplemented by last year's 127,000,000 4 per cent loan (the whole of the loan was to have amounted to 148,000,000 rubles, but 21,000,000 have not yet been subscribed). Does that mean that the deficit was covered by the loan? Nothing of the kind, says our magician. "The raising of the loan was not at all called forth by the necessity to cover expenses unforeseen in the estimates," be-

cause we had 114,000,000 rubles "fully available" for this purpose. The loan was raised to build new railways. Excellent, Mr. Witte! But in the first place, your statement does not refute the fact that there was a deficit, for even the "fully available" 114,000,000 do not cover an expenditure of 144,000,000. Secondly, your available reserve (114,000,000) includes 63,000,000 representing the surplus of the 1901 Budget, and our press has long ago pointed out that you *deliberately underestimate* the revenues in order to swell the "available reserve fund," and steadily increase taxes. Thus last year stamp duties were increased (the new stamp duty regulations), the price of government vodka was raised from 7 rubles to 7.60 rubles per *vedro* [bucket];* import duties were again raised (the new import duties were introduced in 1900 as "temporary" duties, in view of the Chinese War), etc. Thirdly, in extolling the "cultural rôle" of railways, you remain modestly silent about the purely Russian and altogether uncultured habit of *robbing the Treasury* that is indulged in in the course of building railways (quite apart from the outrageous manner in which the railway contractors exploit the labourers and starving peasants!). For example, a Russian newspaper recently reported that the cost of building the Siberian railway was first estimated at 350,000,000 rubles, but it has already cost 780,000,000 rubles, and in all probability will cost *more than 1,000,000,000 rubles* before it is finished (*Iskra* has already mentioned something about the depredations that were going on in the construction of the Siberian railway: *cf.* No. 2).[148] You add up the revenues very accurately, Mr. Witte, but have you ever tried to give an account of the *real amount of expenditure!*

Furthermore, we must not lose sight of the fact that the construction of railways in 1902 was necessitated partly by the military aims of our "peace-loving" government (the enormous Bologoye-Sedletskaya line, extending over one thousand versts), and partly by the unavoidable necessity of giving some little "assistance" to poor downtrodden industry, in the affairs of which the State Bank is directly interested. Not only did the State Bank give generous loans to certain shaky enterprises, but it took many of them practically under its complete control. The bankruptcy of industrial enterprises threatened to lead to state bankruptcy! Finally, we must not forget that under the administration of the "genius" Witte, loans and taxes are steadily increasing, notwithstanding the

* A vedro = 3.25 gallons.—*Ed.*

fact that the whole of the capital of the savings banks is being employed for the purpose of propping up the credit of the state. And this capital now exceeds 800,000,000 rubles. If all this is taken into account, it will become clear that Witte is squandering the public funds, and that the autocracy is slowly but surely sliding to bankruptcy; for taxes cannot be raised without end, and the French bourgeoisie will not always come to the aid of the Tsar.

Witte tries to defend himself against the charge of increasing the indebtedness of the state by arguments that are worthy only of ridicule. He balances debts against "property," compares the total of the state loans floated between 1892 and 1902 with the value of the railways for the same period, and draws the conclusion that there is a diminution in "net" indebtedness. Yes, we still possess some property: "Fortresses and warships" (on our word of honour, this is exactly what he says in the report!), ports and state factories, rents and forests. Excellent, Mr. Witte! But don't you realise that you are behaving like a merchant in the bankruptcy court pleading before his creditors who are preparing to sell off his property? Surely, if an enterprise is absolutely sound, it never enters anybody's head to demand special security for loans. No one doubts for a moment that the Russian nation owns a considerable amount of "property," but the more this property amounts to, the greater is the guilt of those who, notwithstanding this plethora of wealth, administer the affairs of the nation only by increased borrowing and increased taxation. All you are proving, Mr. Witte, is, that the people ought to dismiss those who are administering their property in this wasteful manner as quickly as possible. As a matter of fact, up till now, the only country in Europe that has offered the property of the state as security for state loans has been Turkey. And this offer naturally, has led *the foreign creditors to take control* of this property as a guarantee of re-imbursement of the loans they have granted. The property of the "Great Power of Russia" to be under the control of the agents of Rothschild and Bleichröder! Such is the brilliant prospect you open up for us, Mr. Witte! *

* Witte himself has observed how awkward were the references to "property," hence, he tries to "correct himself" in the second part of his report by stating that the increasing value of the property of the state "has no special significance as far as the obligations of the Russian Treasury are concerned, because Russia's credit does not require any special security." Of course not! But a detailed list of these special securities has been carefully drawn up, nevertheless—in case it may be wanted!

Now as a matter of fact, not a single banker in the world would accept fortresses and warships as security for loans. These are not assets, but liabilities in our national finances. But we will let that point slide. Take railways; even they cannot serve as security unless they bring in revenues. From Witte's report, we learn that right up to recent times all the Russian railways have been run at a loss. Only in 1900 was the deficit on the Siberian railway covered and a "slight net profit" obtained. The profit, however, was so slight that Witte modestly refrains from stating how much it was. He also refrains from stating that during the first eight months of 1901, the receipts from the railways in European Russia declined owing to the crisis. What would the balance sheet of our railways look like if we calculated, not only the official figures of the sums advanced for their construction but also the actual sums embezzled in the course of their construction? Is it not time indeed that this really valuable property was placed in more reliable hands?

Witte, of course, refers to the industrial crisis in the most assuring terms: "A 'hitch' has occurred which, without a doubt, will not affect general industrial achievements, and after a little time has passed, in all probability [!!], a new period of industrial revival will set in." This is fine consolation for the millions of the working class suffering from unemployment and reduced earnings! In vain will you seek in the statement of government expenditure for references to the millions and tens of millions the government has flung right and left for the direct and indirect assistance of the industrial enterprises "suffering" from the crisis. That enormous sums have been disbursed is shown by the fact, reported in the newspapers, that the amount of loans granted by the State Bank from January, 1899, to January, 1901, increased from 250,000,000 rubles to 449,000,000 rubles, and that the amount of industrial loans rose from 8,700,000 rubles to 38,800,000 rubles. Even a loss of 4,000,000 rubles on industrial loans failed to embarrass the Treasury. All the assistance the government rendered to the workers, who sacrificed on the altar of "industrial achievements" not the contents of their purses, but their lives and the lives of the millions of their dependents, was to deport them "gratis" in thousands from the industrial towns to the starving villages!

Witte altogether avoids employing the word "famine," and in his report he states that the "severe effects of the failure of the harvest . . . will be alleviated by generous assistance to the needy." This

generous assistance, according to Witte's own statement, amounts to 20,000,000 rubles, whereas, the deficit of grain is estimated at 250,000,000 (calculated at the very low price of fifty kopecks per pood, but compared in quantity with good harvest years). Very "generous," is it not? Assume, for the sake of argument, that only half the deficit affects the poor peasants; but even on this calculation it will be found that we underestimated the niggardliness of the Russian government when we wrote (concerning Sipyagin's circular) in No. 9 of the *Iskra* that the government was reducing the loans to *one fifth.** The Russian Tsar is generous, not in his assistance to the muzhik, but in police measures against those who genuinely desired to assist the famine-stricken. He is also generous in squandering millions for the purpose of carving as choice a morsel as possible out of China. Witte reports that in the course of two years, 80,000,000 rubles were spent as extraordinary expenditure on the Chinese War, and "*in addition to that* a very considerable sum was spent for the same purpose *out of the ordinary budget.*" Consequently, in all *up to 100,000,000 rubles* were probably spent, if not more! The unemployed workingman and the starving muzhik may console themselves with the thought that probably Manchuria will be ours. . . .

Lack of space compels us to deal only briefly with the remaining parts of the report. Witte tries to defend himself also against the charge of being niggardly in expenditure on education. To the 36,000,000 rubles appropriated for the Ministry of Education he adds all the sums expended on education by all the other ministries, and in this way obtains the figure of 75,000,000 rubles. But even this (extremely doubtful) figure is extremely miserly for the whole of Russia, and in fact is less than five per cent of the total budget. Witte is of the opinion that the fact that "our state budget is chiefly based on the system of indirect taxation" is an advantage, and repeats the threadbare bourgeois arguments about the possibility of "regulating the consumption of taxed commodities by the degree of prosperity." As a matter of fact, as is well known, indirect taxation imposed on the commodities consumed by the masses is extremely unfair, because the brunt of such taxation falls upon the shoulders of the poor and exempts the rich. The poorer a man is the larger is the share of income he gives to the state in the form of indirect taxes. The poor and very poor represent nine-tenths of

* See p. 291, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

the whole population, consume nine-tenths of the commodities that are taxed, and pay nine-tenths of the total sum of indirect taxes, whereas they receive only about two or three-tenths of the total national income.

An interesting "trifle" in conclusion. What items of expenditure increased most between 1901 and 1902? The total expenditure rose from 1,788,000,000 rubles to 1,946,000,000 rubles, *i. e.*, by less than one-tenth, but *two* items increased *almost by one-fourth*: "The maintenance of the Imperial family"—from 9,800,000 rubles to 12,800,000 rubles, and for the "maintenance of the special corps of gendarmes" from 3,960,000 rubles, to 4,940,000 rubles. Here you have the reply to the question: what are the most pressing "needs of the Russian people?" And what touching "unity" there is between the Tsar and the gendarmes!

Iskra, No. 15, January 15. 1902.

POLITICAL AGITATION AND "THE CLASS POINT-OF-VIEW"

We shall commence with an illustration.

The reader will probably remember the sensation that was caused by the lecture delivered by M. A. Stakhovich, the marshal of the nobility of the province of Oryol, at a missionary congress in the course of which he urged that *liberty of conscience* be recognised by law. The conservative press led by *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* is conducting a furious campaign against Mr. Stakhovich. It cannot find names bad enough to call him, and almost goes so far as to charge all the nobility of Oryol with high treason for having re-elected Mr. Stakhovich as their marshal. Now, this re-election is indeed very significant and to a certain degree bears the character of a demonstration of the nobility against police tyranny and outrage.

Stakhovich, says *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti,* "is known not so much as marshal of nobility, but as jolly Misha Stakhovich,* the soul of good company who possesses the gift of the gab. . . ." [1901, No. 348.] [149] The worse for you, gentlemen, you champions of the big stick. If even your jolly landlords begin to talk about liberty of conscience, then the despicable conduct of the priests and the police must indeed have exceeded all bounds. . . . "What concern has the 'intellectual,' frivolous crowd that instigates and applauds the Stakhoviches, for the affairs of our sacred orthodox faith and our time-honoured attitude towards it?" . . . Once again: All the worse for you, gentlemen, champions of the autocracy, of the orthodox faith and of nationalism. A fine system our police-ridden autocracy must be indeed, if it has permeated even religion with the spirit of the jail to such an extent that the "Stakhoviches" (who have no firm religious convictions, but who are interested, as we shall see, in preserving religion) become completely indifferent towards (if they do not actually hate) this notorious "national" faith! ". . . They call our faith a delusion!! They mock at us because, thanks to this 'delusion,' we fear and avoid sin and carry out our obligations uncomplainingly no matter how severe they may be; because we find the strength and courage to bear sorrow and priva-

* Misha—the diminutive for Michael.—*Ed.*

tions, and forebear pride during success and good fortune. . . ." So this is what it is, is it?! The orthodox faith is so dear to them because it teaches to bear misfortune "uncomplainingly"! What a profitable faith it is indeed for the governing classes! In a society so organised that an insignificant minority enjoys wealth and power, while the masses constantly suffer "deprivation" and bear "severe obligations," it is quite natural for the exploiters to sympathise with the religion that teaches "uncomplainingly" to bear the woes of hell on earth for the sake of an alleged celestial paradise. But in its zeal *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* becomes too garrulous. So garrulous in fact, that *unwittingly it spoke the truth.* Listen further: ". . . They do not realise that thanks to this 'delusion' they, the Stakoviches, eat well, sleep peacefully, and live merrily."

This is the sacred truth! This is precisely the case. Precisely because religious "delusions" are so widespread among the masses of the people, that the Stakhoviches and the Oblomovs,* and all our capitalists who live by the labour of these masses, and even *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* itself, "sleep peacefully." And the more education spreads among the people, the more religious prejudices will give way to Socialist consciousness, the nearer will be the day of victory of the proletariat—the victory that will emancipate all oppressed classes from the slavery they endure in modern society.

But having blurted out the truth on one point *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* goes entirely off the mark on another interesting point. It is obviously mistaken in believing that the Stakhoviches "do not realise" the significance of religion, and that they demand liberal forms, simply because they are "frivolous." Such an explanation of the conduct of a hostile political tendency is too childish! The fact that, in this instance, Mr. Stakhovich came forward as the herald of a definite liberal tendency was proved best of all by *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* itself; otherwise, why did it raise such a campaign over a single lecture? And why did it speak, not about Stakhovich, but about the *Stakhoviches,* about the "intellectual crowd"?

Moskovskiye Vyedomosti's error was, of course, deliberate. It no more desires than it is able to analyse the liberalism it hates, from the class point-of-view. That it does not desire to do so goes without saying; but its inability to do so interests us ever so much more, because this is a complaint that even very many revolutionists and Socialists suffer from. For example, the authors of the letter pub-

* The indolent hero of Goncharov's novel of the same name.—*Ed.*

lished in No. 12 of *Iskra* accusing us of departing from the "class point-of-view" because we, in our newspaper, strive to investigate all manifestations of liberal discontent and protest, suffer from this complaint; as also do the authors of *The Proletarian Struggle* [150] and of several pamphlets in *The Social-Democratic Library,*[151] who imagine that our autocracy represents the autocratic rule of the bourgeoisie; and the Martynovs, who are trying to persuade us to abandon the universal exposure campaign (*i. e.,* the widest possible political agitation) against the autocracy, and to concentrate our efforts mainly upon the struggle for economic reforms (to give something "positive" to the working class, to put forward in its name "concrete demands" for legislative and administrative measures "which promise certain palpable results"); and the Nadezhdins who, on reading the correspondence in our paper about the statistical conflicts ask in astonishment: "Good lord, isn't this a Zemstvo organ?" [152]—they all suffer from this complaint.

All the above-mentioned Socialists forget that the interests of the autocracy coincide only with certain interests of the propertied classes, and only under certain circumstances; frequently it happens that its interests do not coincide with these classes as a whole, but only with the interests of certain strata of them. The interests of other strata of the bourgeoisie, and the more widely understood interests *of the whole of* the bourgeoisie, of the development of capitalism as a whole, necessarily give rise to a liberal opposition against the autocracy. For example, while the autocracy guarantees to the bourgeoisie opportunities for employing the crudest forms of exploitation, it, on the other hand, places a thousand obstacles in the way of the wide development of productive forces and the spread of education, and by this, rouses against itself, not only the petty bourgeoisie, but also the big bourgeoisie. While the autocracy guarantees (?) the bourgeoisie protection against Socialism, this protection, however, in view of the disfranchisement of the people, is transformed into a system of police outrage that rouses the indignation of all and sundry. The results of these antagonistic tendencies, the relative strength of conservative and liberal views, or tendencies, among the bourgeoisie at the present moment, cannot be learned from a couple of general postulates; they are determined by all the special features of the present social and political situation. To be able to define them, one must study the situation in detail, and carefully watch all the conflicts that take place with the

government, no matter by what social strata they are initiated. It is precisely the "class point-of-view" that *prevents* a Social-Democrat from remaining indifferent to the dissatisfaction and protests of the "Stakhoviches."

The above-mentioned Socialists, by their reasoning and activity, show that they are indifferent to liberalism, and by that reveal their failure to understand the fundamental postulates of the *Communist Manifesto,* the "Bible" of International Social-Democracy. Recall what is said there about the bourgeoisie itself providing material for the political education of the proletariat by its struggle for power, by the conflicts of various strata and groups within it, etc.[153] Only in politically free countries has the proletariat easy access to this material (and then only to part of it). In slave-ridden Russia, however, we Social-Democrats must work hard to obtain this "material" for the working class, *i. e.,* we must *ourselves undertake* the task of conducting general political agitation, of carrying on a public exposure campaign against the autocracy. And this task is particularly imperative in periods of political ferment. We must bear in mind that in one year of political animation, the proletariat can obtain more revolutionary training than in several years of political calm. That is why the tendency of the above-mentioned Socialists consciously or unconsciously to *restrict* the scope and content of political agitation is particularly harmful.

Recall also what is said in the *Communist Manifesto* about Communists supporting *every* revolutionary movement against the present system.[154] Those words are often interpreted too narrowly, and are not taken to imply support for the liberal opposition. It must not be forgotten, however, that periods come when every conflict with the government arising out of progressive public interests, no matter how small they may be, may, under certain conditions (*and our support is one of these conditions*) flare up into a general conflagration. It is sufficient to recall the great public movement which grew up in Russia out of the conflict between the students and the government over academic demands, or the conflict that arose in France between all the progressive elements and the militarists, over a trial in which the verdict was given on the basis of forged documents.[155] That is why it is our bounden duty to explain this to the proletariat, and to widen and support, with the active participation of the workers, every liberal and democratic protest, no matter what it is connected with: Whether these be

conflicts between the Zemstvo and the Ministry of the Interior, between the nobility and the police-ecclesiastical authorities, or between the statisticians and the bureaucrats, between the peasants and the Zemstvo chiefs, between the religious sects and the rural police, etc., etc. Those who contemptuously turn up their noses at the pettiness of some of these conflicts, or at the "hopelessness" of the attempts to fan these into a general conflagration, forget that universal political agitation is a focus in which the immediate interests of political education of the proletariat coincide with the immediate interests of social development as a whole, of the development of the whole of the people, that is to say, of all the democratic elements of the people. It is our bounden duty to intervene in every liberal problem, to define our, Social-Democratic, attitude towards it, to take measures to secure that the proletariat takes an active part in the solution of this problem, and to compel it to solve it in its own, proletarian way. Those who refrain from intervening in this way (no matter what intentions they have for doing so) leave the liberals in command, place in their hands the task of politically training the workers, and concede the hegemony in the political struggle to elements which, in the final analysis, are leaders of bourgeois democracy.

The class character of the Social-Democratic movement must not be expressed by restricting our tasks to the direct and immediate needs of the "purely labour" movement. It must be expressed in our leadership of every aspect and every manifestation of the great struggle for liberation that is being conducted by the proletariat, the only genuinely revolutionary class in modern society. Social-Democracy must constantly and unswervingly spread the influence of the labour movement to all spheres of public and political life of modern society. It must not only lead the economic struggle of the workers, but also the political struggle of the proletariat. It must never for a moment lose sight of our ultimate goal and always carry on propaganda for, protect from distortion and develop further, the proletarian ideology—the theories of scientific Socialism, *i. e.*, Marxism. We must untiringly combat all bourgeois ideology, no matter what fashionable and striking garb it may wear. The Socialists we have mentioned above retreat from the "class" point of view also because and to the extent that they remain indifferent to the task of combating "criticism of Marxism." Only the blind can fail to see that this "criticism" has taken root more

rapidly in Russia than in any other country, and has been more enthusiastically taken up by Russian liberal publicists than by any other, precisely because it is one of the elements of the bourgeois (and now consciously bourgeois) democracy that is growing up in Russia.

It is particularly in regard to the political struggle that the "class point-of-view" demands that the proletariat shall *push on* every democratic movement. The political demands of working-class democracy do not differ in principle from bourgeois democracy, they differ only in degree. In the struggle for economic emancipation, for the social revolution, the proletariat stands on a different basis of principles from that upon which the bourgeoisie stands, and it stands on that basis by itself (the small producer will come to the aid of the proletariat only to the extent that he comes over, or is preparing to come over to the ranks of the proletariat). In the struggle for political liberation, however, we have many allies towards whom we simply cannot remain indifferent. But while, in fighting for liberal reforms, our allies in the camp of bourgeois democracy will always glance behind, and try to arrange things so that they may be able to continue as before "to eat well, sleep peacefully, and live merrily" at other people's expense, the proletariat will march forward to the end, without looking back. While the confrères of R. N. S. (the author of the preface to Witte's Memorandum) haggle with the government over the rights of the Zemstvo, or over a constitution, we shall fight for a democratic republic. We shall not forget, however, that in order to push somebody on, we must continually keep our hands on that somebody's shoulders. The party of the proletariat must learn to catch every liberal just at the moment when he is prepared to move forward an inch, and compel him to move forward a yard. If he is obstinate and won't—we shall go forward without him, and over his body.

Iskra, No. 16, February 14, 1902.

Что дѣлать?

Наболѣвшіе вопросы нашего движенія

Н. ЛЕНИНА.

. . . „Партійная борьба придаетъ партіи силу и жизненность, величайшимъ доказательствомъ слабости партіи является ея расплывчатость и притупленіе рѣзко обозначенныхъ границъ, партія укрѣпляется тѣмъ, что очищаетъ себя“ . . . (Изъ письма Лассаля къ Марксу отъ 24 іюня 1852 г.).

Цѣна 1 руб.

Preis 2 Mark = 2.50 Francs.

STUTTGART
Verlag von J. H. W. Dietz Nachf. (G. m. b. H.)
1902

Facsimile of Cover of First Edition of *What Is To Be Done?*

WHAT IS TO BE DONE? [156]

Burning Questions of Our Movement

> . . . Party struggles . . . give a party strength and life. . . . The best proof of the weakness of a party is its diffuseness and its blurring of clear-cut differences. . . . A party becomes stronger by purging itself.
>
> [From a letter by Lassalle to Marx, dated June 24, 1852.]

Written between the autumn of 1901 and February, 1902. First published as a separate pamphlet in March, 1902, Stuttgart, Dietz.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

PREFACE

According to the author's original plan, the present pamphlet was intended for the purpose of developing in greater detail the ideas that were expressed in the article he wrote in *Iskra,* No. 4, May, 1901, entitled "Where to Begin." * First of all, we must apologise to the reader for this belated fulfilment of the promise made in that article (and repeated in reply to many private enquiries and letters). One of the reasons for this belatedness was the attempt to combine all the Social-Democratic organisations abroad which was undertaken in June last (1901). Naturally, one wanted to see the results of this attempt for, had it been successful, it would perhaps have been necessary to express *Iskra's* views on organisation from another point of view. In any case, such success promised to put an end very quickly to the existence of two separate tendencies in Russian Social-Democracy. As the reader knows, the attempt failed, and, as we shall try to show farther on, failure was inevitable after the new turn *Rabocheye Dyelo* took in its issue No. 10 towards Economism. It was found to be absolutely necessary to commence a determined fight against these diffused, ill-defined, but very persistent tendencies, which may degenerate into many diverse forms. Accordingly, the original plan of the pamphlet was changed and considerably enlarged.

Its main theme was to have been the three questions presented in the article: "Where to Begin," *viz.*, the character and the principal content of our political agitation; our organisational tasks; and the plan for setting up simultaneously in various parts of the country, a militant, All-Russian organisation. These questions have long engaged the mind of the author, and he tried to raise them in the *Rabochaya Gazeta* at the time one of the unsuccessful attempts was made to revive that paper (*cf.* Chap. V). But the original plan to confine this pamphlet to these three questions, and to express our views as far as possible in a positive form without, or almost without, entering into polemics, proved quite impracticable for two

* See p. 109, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

reasons. One was that Economism proved to be more virile than we supposed (we employ the term Economism in the broad sense as it was explained in *Iskra* No. 12, December, 1901, in an article entitled "A Conversation with Defenders of Economism," which represented a synopsis, as it were, of the present pamphlet).* It became unquestionably clear that the differences regarding the solution of the three problems mentioned were to be explained to a much greater degree by the fundamental antagonism between the two tendencies in Russian Social-Democracy than by differences over practical questions. The second reason was that the astonishment displayed by the Economists concerning the views we expressed in *Iskra* revealed quite clearly that we often speak in different tongues, and therefore *cannot* come to any understanding without going over the whole range of questions *ab ovo;* ** that it was necessary to attempt in the simplest possible style, illustrated by numerous and concrete examples, *systematically "to clear up" all* the fundamental points of difference with *all* the Economists. I resolved to make this attempt to "clear up" these points, fully realising that it would greatly increase the size of the pamphlet and delay its publication, but I saw *no other way* of fulfilling the promise I made in the article "Where to Begin." In apologising for the belated publication of the pamphlet I also have to apologise for its numerous literary shortcomings. I had to work *under great pressure,* and frequently had to interrupt the writing of it for other work.

The three questions mentioned before still represent the main theme of this pamphlet, but I had to start out with the examination of two other, more general questions, *viz.*, Why does an "innocent" and "natural" slogan like "freedom of criticism" represent a fighting watchword for us at the present time? And why can we not agree on even so important a question as the rôle of Social-Democracy in relation to the spontaneous mass movement? Furthermore, the exposition of our views on the character and the content of political agitation developed into an explanation of the difference between trade-union politics and Social-Democratic politics, and the exposition of our views on organisational tasks developed into an explanation of the difference between primitive methods, which satisfy the Economists, and an organisation of revolutionists, which in our

* See p. 65 of this book.—*Ed.*

** Literally "from the egg"; from the beginning.—*Ed.*

opinion is essential. Moreover, I insist more strongly than ever on the plan for a national political newspaper, the more so because of the weakness of the arguments that were levelled against it, and because the question that I put in the article "Where to Begin" as to how we can set to work simultaneously, all over the country, to establish the organisation we require was never really answered. Finally, in the concluding part of this pamphlet I hope to prove that we did all we could to avoid a rupture with the Economists, but the rupture proved inevitable; that *Rabocheye Dyelo* acquired special, "historical," if you will, significance not so much because it expressed consistent Economism, but because it fully and strikingly expressed the confusion and vacillation that marks a *whole period* in the history of Russian Social-Democracy, and that therefore, the polemics with *Rabocheye Dyelo*, which at first sight may seem excessively detailed, also acquires significance; for we can make no progress until we have completely liquidated this period.

February, 1902.

I

DOGMATISM AND "FREEDOM OF CRITICISM"

A. What is "Freedom of Criticism"?

"Freedom of criticism," this undoubtedly is the most fashionable slogan at the present time, and the one most frequently employed in the controversies between the Socialists and democrats of all countries. At first sight, nothing would appear to be more strange than the solemn appeals by one of the parties to the dispute for freedom of criticism. Can it be that some of the progressive parties have raised their voices against the constitutional law of the majority of European countries which guarantees freedom to science and scientific investigation? "Something must be wrong here," an onlooker, who has not yet fully appreciated the nature of the disagreements among the controversialists will say, when he hears this fashionable slogan repeated at every cross-road. "Evidently this slogan is one of the conventional phrases which, like a nickname, becomes legitimatised by custom," he will conclude.

In fact, it is no secret that two separate tendencies have been formed in international Social-Democracy.* The fight between these tendencies now flares up in a bright flame, and now dies down and smoulders under the ashes of imposing "resolutions for an armistice." What this "new" tendency, which adopts a "critical" attitude

* This, perhaps, is the first occasion in the history of modern Socialism that controversies between various tendencies within the Socialist movement have grown from national into international controversies; and this is extremely encouraging. Formerly, the disputes between the Lassalleans and the Eisenachers,[157] between the Guesdists and the Possibilists,[158] between the Fabians and the Social-Democrats,[159] and between the Narodniki and the Social-Democrats in Russia, remained purely national disputes, reflected purely national features and proceeded, as it were, on different planes. At the present time (this is quite evident now) the English Fabians, the French Ministerialists, the German Bernsteinists [revisionists.—*Ed.*], and the Russian "Critics"—all belong to the same family, all extol each other, learn from each other, and are rallying their forces against "doctrinaire" Marxism. Perhaps, in this first real battle with Socialist opportunism, international revolutionary Social-Democracy will become sufficiently hardened to be able, at last, to put an end to the political reaction, long reigning in Europe.

towards "obsolete doctrinaire" Marxism represents, has been *stated* with sufficient precision by Bernstein, and *demonstrated* by Millerand.

Social-Democracy must change from a party of the social revolution into a democratic party of social reforms. Bernstein has surrounded this political demand by a whole battery of symmetrically arranged "new" arguments and reasonings. The possibility of putting Socialism on a scientific basis and of proving that it is necessary and inevitable from the point of view of the materialist conception of history was denied; the fact of increasing poverty, proletarianisation, the growing acuteness of capitalist contradictions, were also denied. The very conception of "*ultimate aim*" was declared to be unsound, and the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat was absolutely rejected. It was denied that there is any difference in principle between liberalism and Socialism. *The theory of the class struggle* was rejected on the grounds that it could not be applied to strictly democratic society, governed according to the will of the majority, etc.

Thus, the demand for a decided change from revolutionary Social-Democracy to bourgeois reformism, was accompanied by a no less decided turn towards bourgeois criticism of all the fundamental ideas of Marxism. As this criticism of Marxism has been going on for a long time now, from the political platform, from university chairs, in numerous pamphlets, and in a number of scientific works, as the younger generation of the educated classes have been systematically trained for decades on this criticism, it is not surprising that the "new, critical" tendency in Social-Democracy should spring up, all complete, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter. This new tendency did not have to grow and develop, it was transferred bodily from bourgeois literature to Socialist literature.

If Bernstein's theoretical criticism and political yearnings are still obscure to any one, the trouble the French have taken to demonstrate the "new method" should remove all ambiguities. In this instance, also, France has justified its old reputation as the country in which "more than anywhere else the historical class struggles were always fought to a finish" [Engels, in his introduction to Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire*]. The French Socialists have commenced, not to theorise, but to act. The more developed democratic political conditions in France have permitted them to put Bernstein-

ism into practice immediately, with its inevitable consequences. Millerand has provided an excellent example of practical Bernsteinism. It is not surprising that he so zealously defends and praises Bernstein and Volmar! Indeed, if Social-Democracy, in essentials, is merely a reformist party, and must be bold enough to admit this openly, then, not only has a Socialist the right to join a bourgeois cabinet, but he ought always to strive to obtain places in it. If democracy, in essence, means the abolition of class domination, then why should not a Socialist minister charm the whole bourgeois world by orations on class co-operation? Why should he not remain in the cabinet even after the shooting down of workers by gendarmes has exposed, for the hundredth and thousandth time, the real nature of the democratic co-operation of classes? Why should he not personally take part in welcoming the Tsar, for whom the French Socialists now have no other sobriquet than "Hero of the Gallows, Knout and Banishment" (*knouteur, pendeur et deportateur*)? And the reward for this humiliation and self-degradation of Socialism in the face of the whole world, for the corruption of the Socialist consciousness of the working class—the only thing that can guarantee victory—the reward for this is, imposing *plans* for niggardly reforms, so niggardly in fact, that much more has been obtained even from bourgeois governments.

He who does not deliberately close his eyes cannot fail to see that the new "critical" tendency in Socialism is nothing more nor less than a new species of *opportunism.* And if we judge people not by the brilliant uniforms they deck themselves in, not by the imposing appellations they give themselves, but by their actions, and by what they actually advocate, it will be clear that "freedom of criticism" means freedom for an opportunistic tendency in Social-Democracy, the freedom to convert Social-Democracy into a democratic reformist party, the freedom to introduce bourgeois ideas and bourgeois elements into Socialism.

"Freedom" is a grand word, but under the banner of Free Trade the most predatory wars were conducted; under the banner of "free labour," the toilers were robbed. The term "freedom of criticism" contains the same inherent falsehood. Those who are really convinced that they have advanced science, would demand, not freedom for the new views to continue side by side with the old, but the substitution of the old views by the new views. The cry "Long live

freedom of criticism," that is heard to-day, too strongly calls to mind the fable of the empty barrel.*

We are marching in a compact group along a precipitous and difficult path, firmly holding each other by the hand. We are surrounded on all sides by enemies, and are under their almost constant fire. We have combined voluntarily, especially for the purpose of fighting the enemy and not to retreat into the adjacent marsh, the inhabitants of which, right from the very outset, have reproached us with having separated ourselves into an exclusive group, and with having chosen the path of struggle instead of the path of conciliation. And now several in our crowd begin to cry out—let us go into this marsh! And when we begin to shame them, they retort: How conservative you are! Are you not ashamed to deny us the right to invite you to take a better road!

Oh yes, gentlemen! You are free, not only to invite us, but to go yourselves wherever you will, even into the marsh. In fact, we think that the marsh is your proper place, and we are prepared to render *you* every assistance to get there. Only, let go of our hands, don't clutch at us, and don't besmirch the grand word "freedom"; for we too are "free" to go where we please, free, not only to fight against the marsh, but also those who are turning towards the marsh.

B. The New Advocates of "Freedom of Criticism"

Now, this slogan ("Freedom of criticism") is solemnly advanced in No. 10 of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, the organ of the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, not as a theoretical postulate, but as a political demand, as a reply to the question: "Is it possible to unite the Social-Democratic organisations operating abroad?"—"In order that unity may be durable, there must be freedom of criticism" [p. 36].

From this statement two very definite conclusions must be drawn: 1. That *Rabocheye Dyelo* has taken the opportunist tendency in international Social-Democracy under its wing; and 2. That *Rabocheye Dyelo* demands freedom for opportunism in Russian Social-Democracy. We shall examine these conclusions.

Rabocheye Dyelo is "particularly" displeased with *Iskra's* and

* The allusion here is to Krylov's fable about the full and empty barrels rolling down the street, the second with much more noise than the first.—*Ed.*

Zarya's "inclination to predict a rupture between the *Mountain* and the *Gironde* in international Social-Democracy." *

> Generally speaking [writes Krichevsky, editor of *Rabocheye Dyelo*] this talk about the *Mountain* and the *Gironde* that is heard in the ranks of Social-Democracy, represents a shallow historical analogy, which looks strange when it comes from the pen of a Marxist. The Mountain and the Gironde did not represent two different temperaments, or intellectual tendencies, as idealist historians may think, but two different classes, or strata—the middle bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat on the other. In the modern Socialist movement, however, there is no conflict of class interests; the Socialist movement in its entirety, *all* its diverse forms [B. K.'s italics] including the most pronounced Bernsteinists stand on the basis of the class interests of the proletariat, and of the proletarian class struggle for political and economic emancipation [pp. 32-33].

A bold assertion! B. Krichevsky, have you heard the fact long ago noted, that it is precisely the extensive participation of the "academic" *stratum* in the Socialist movement in recent years that has secured the rapid spread of Bernsteinism? And what is most important—on what does our author base his opinion that even "the most pronounced Bernsteinists" stand on the basis of the class struggle for the political and economic emancipation of the proletariat? No one knows. This determined defence of the most pronounced Bernsteinists is not supported by any kind of argument whatever. Apparently, the author believes that if he repeats what the pronounced Bernsteinists say about themselves, his assertion requires no proof. But can anything more "shallow" be imagined than an opinion of a whole tendency that is based on nothing more than what the representatives of that tendency say about themselves? Can anything more shallow be imagined than the subsequent "homily" about the two different, and even diametrically opposite, types, or paths, of party development? [*Rabocheye Dyelo*, pp. 33-35.] The German Social-Democrats, you see, recognise complete freedom of criticism, but the French do not, and it is precisely the latter that present an example of the "harmfulness of intolerance."

* A comparison between the two tendencies in the revolutionary proletariat (the revolutionary and the opportunist), and the two tendencies among the revolutionary bourgeoisie in the eighteenth century (the Jacobin Mountain and the Gironde) was made in a leading article in *Iskra*, No. 2, February, 1901, written by Plekhanov.[160] The Cadets, the *Bezzaglavsti*[161] and the Mensheviks to this day love to refer to the Jacobinism in Russian Social-Democracy but they prefer to remain silent about or . . . to forget the circumstances in which Plekhanov used this term for the first time against the Right Wing of Social-Democracy.

To which we reply that the very example B. Krichevsky quotes, illustrates how even those who regard history, literally from the Ilovaisky * point-of-view sometimes describe themselves as Marxists. Of course, there is no need whatever, in explaining the unity of the German Socialist Party and the dismembered state of the French Socialist Party, to search for the special features in the history of the respective countries, to compare the conditions of military semi-absolutism in the one country with republican parliamentarism in the other, or to analyse the effects of the Paris Commune and the effects of the anti-Socialist laws in Germany; to compare the economic life and economic development of the two countries, or recall that "the unexampled growth of German Social-Democracy" was accompanied by a strenuous struggle unexampled in the history of Socialism, not only against the theoreticians (Muehlberger, Duehring),** the Socialists of the Chair,[163] but also against mistaken tactics (Lassalle), etc., etc. All that is superfluous! The French quarrel among themselves because they are intolerant; the Germans are united because they are good fellows.

And observe, this piece of matchless profundity is intended to "refute" the fact which is a complete answer to the defence of Bernsteinism. The question as to whether the Bernsteinists stand on the basis of the class struggle of the proletariat can be completely and irrevocably answered only by historical experience. Consequently, the example of France is the most important one in this respect, because France is the only country in which the Bernsteinists attempted to stand independently on their own feet with the warm approval of their German colleagues (and partly also of the

* Ilovaisky—the writer of official school text books on history noted for his reactionary treatment of Russian history.—*Ed.*

** At the time Engels hurled his attack against Duehring, many representatives of German Social-Democracy inclined towards the latter's views, and accusations of acerbity, intolerance, uncomradely polemics, etc., were publicly hurled at Engels at the party congress. At the congress of 1877, Johann Most, supported by his comrades, moved a resolution to prohibit the publication of Engels' articles in the *Vorwaerts* because "they did not represent the interests of the overwhelming majority of the readers," and Vahlteich declared that the publication of these articles had caused great damage to the party, that Duehring had also rendered services to Social-Democracy: "We must utilise the services of all those who offer them in the interest of the party; let the professors engage in polemics if they care to do so, but the *Vorwaerts* is not the place to conduct them in" [*Vorwaerts*, No. 65, June 6, 1877].[162] Here we have another example of the defence of "freedom of criticism," and it would do our legal critics and illegal opportunists who love so much to quote examples from the Germans, a deal of good to ponder over it!

Russian opportunists). [*Cf. Rabocheye Dyelo*, Nos. 2-3, pp. 83-84.] [164] The reference to the "intolerance" of the French, apart from its "historical" significance (in the Nozdrev sense),* turns out to be merely an attempt to obscure a very unpleasant fact with angry invectives.

But we are not even prepared to make a present of the Germans to B. Krichevsky and to the other numerous champions of "freedom of criticism." The "most pronounced Bernsteinists" are still tolerated in the ranks of the German Party only because they *submit* to the Hanover resolution [165] which emphatically rejected Bernstein's "amendments," and to the Luebeck resolution,[166] which, notwithstanding the diplomatic terms in which it is couched, contains a direct warning to Bernstein. It is a debatable point from the standpoint of the interests of the German party, as to whether diplomacy was appropriate in this case and whether, in this case, a bad peace is better than a good quarrel.** Opinions may differ in regard to the expediency or not of the *methods* employed to reject Bernsteinism, but the fact remains that the German party *did reject* Bernsteinism on two occasions. Therefore, to think that the German example endorses the thesis: "The most pronounced Bernsteinists stand for the proletarian class struggle, for its economic and political emancipation," means to fail absolutely to understand what is going on before one's eyes.***

* A character in Gogol's novel *Dead Souls*. An unusual liar, rogue, and intriguer, he was frequently beaten for cheating, but he never took matters to heart; to blackmail even a friend was an ordinary thing for him and he "bore no grudge against that person."—*Ed.*

** This is a Russian proverb.—*Ed.*

*** It must be observed that *Rabocheye Dyelo* always confines itself to a bare statement of facts concerning Bernsteinism, and "refrains" from expressing its own opinion on it. See, for example, the reports of the Stuttgart Congress [167] in Nos. 2-3 [p. 66], in which all the disagreements are reduced to disagreements over "tactics," and the bare statement is made that the overwhelming majority remain true to the previous revolutionary tactics. Or take Nos. 4-5 [p. 25 *ff.*], in which we have a bare paraphrasing of the speeches delivered at the Hanover Congress, and a reprint of the resolution moved by Bebel. An explanation and criticism of Bernstein is again put off (as was the case in Nos. 2-3) to be dealt with in a "special article." Curiously enough, in Nos. 4-5 [p. 33], we read the following: " . . . the views expounded by Bebel have the support of the enormous majority of the congress," and a few lines lower: " . . . David defended Bernstein's views. . . . First of all, he tried to show that . . . Bernstein and his friends, after all is said and done [*sic!*], stand for the class struggle. . . ." This was written in December, 1899,[168] and in September, 1901, *Rabocheye Dyelo*, having perhaps lost faith in the correctness of Bebel's views, repeats David's views as its own!

More than that. As we have already observed, *Rabocheye Dyelo* comes before *Russian* Social-Democracy, demands "freedom of criticism," and defends Bernsteinism. Apparently, it came to the conclusion that we were unfair to our "critics" and Bernsteinists. To whom were we unfair, when and how? About this not a word. *Rabocheye Dyelo* does not name a single Russian critic or Bernsteinist! All that is left for us to do is to make one of two possible suppositions: First, that the unfairly treated party is none other than *Rabocheye Dyelo* itself (and that appears to be confirmed by the fact that in the two articles in No. 10 reference is made only to the insults hurled at the *Rabocheye Dyelo* by *Zarya* and *Iskra*). If that is the case, how is the strange fact to be explained that *Rabocheye Dyelo*, which always vehemently dissociates itself from Bernsteinism, could not defend itself, without putting in a word on behalf of the "most pronounced Bernsteinists" and of freedom of criticism? The second supposition is, that a third party has been treated unfairly. If the second supposition is correct, why should not this party be named?

We see, therefore, that *Rabocheye Dyelo* is continuing to play the game of hide and seek that it has played (as we shall prove below) ever since it commenced publication. And note the *first* practical application of this much-extolled "freedom of criticism." As a matter of fact, not only has it now been reduced to abstention from all criticism, but also to abstention from expressing independent views altogether. The very *Rabocheye Dyelo,* which avoids mentioning Russian Bernsteinism as if it were a shameful disease (to use Starover's apt expression) [169] proposes, for the treatment of this disease, *to copy word for word* the latest German prescription for the treatment of the German variety of the disease! Instead of freedom of criticism—slavish (worse: monkey-like) imitation! The very same social and political content of modern international opportunism reveals itself in a variety of ways according to its national characteristics. In one country the opportunists long ago came out under a separate flag, while in others, they ignore theory, and conduct a Radical-Socialist policy of practical politics. In a third country, several members of the revolutionary party have deserted to the camp of opportunism and strive to achieve their aims, not by an open struggle for principles and for new tactics, but by gradual, unobserved and if one may so express it, unpunishable corruption of their party. In a fourth country again, similar deserters

employ the same methods in the twilight of their political slavishness, and with an extremely original combination of "legal" with "illegal" activity, etc., etc. To talk about freedom of criticism and Bernsteinism as a condition for uniting the *Russian* Social-Democrats, and not to explain how *Russian* Bernsteinism has manifested itself, and what fruits it has borne, means to talk for the purpose of saying nothing.

We shall try, if only in a few words, to say what *Rabocheye Dyelo* did not want to say (or perhaps did not even understand).

C. Criticism in Russia

The peculiar position of Russia in regard to the point we are examining is that *right from the very beginning* of the spontaneous labour movement on the one hand, and the change of progressive public opinion towards Marxism on the other, a combination was observed of obviously heterogeneous elements under a common flag for the purpose of fighting the common enemy (obsolete social and political views). We refer to the heyday of "legal Marxism." Speaking generally, this was an extremely curious phenomenon, that no one in the eighties, or the beginning of the nineties, would have believed possible. Suddenly, in a country ruled by an autocracy, in which the press is completely shackled, and in a period of intense political reaction in which even the tiniest outgrowth of political discontent and protest was suppressed, a *censored* literature springs up, advocating the theory of revolutionary Marxism, in a language extremely obscure, but understood by the "interested." The government had accustomed itself to regard only the theory of (revolutionary) Populism as dangerous without observing its internal evolution as is usually the case, and rejoicing at the criticism, levelled against it *no matter from what side it came.* Quite a considerable time elapsed (according to our Russian calculations) before the government realised what had happened and the unwieldy army of censors and gendarmes discovered the new enemy and flung itself upon him. Meanwhile, Marxian books were published one after another, Marxian journals and newspapers were published, nearly every one became a Marxist, Marxism was flattered, the Marxists were courted and the book publishers rejoiced at the extraordinary ready sale of Marxian literature. It is quite reasonable to suppose that among the Marxian novices who were carried away by

this stream, there was more than one "author who got a swelled head. . . ."[170]

We can now speak calmly of this period as of an event of the past. It is no secret that the brief appearance of Marxism on the surface of our literature was called forth by the alliance between people of extreme and of extremely moderate views. In point of fact, the latter were bourgeois democrats; and this was the conclusion (so strikingly confirmed by their subsequent "critical" development), that intruded itself on the minds of certain persons even when the "alliance" was still intact.*

That being the case, does not the responsibility for the subsequent "confusion" rest mainly upon the revolutionary Social-Democrats who entered into alliance with these future "critics"? This question, together with a reply in the affirmative, is sometimes heard from people with excessively rigid views. But these people are absolutely wrong. Only those who have no reliance in themselves can fear to enter into temporary alliances with unreliable people. Besides, not a single political party could exist without entering into such alliances. The combination with the legal Marxists was in its way the first, really political alliance contracted by Russian Social-Democrats. Thanks to this alliance an astonishingly rapid victory was obtained over Populism, and Marxian ideas (even though in a vulgarised form) became very widespread. Moreover, the alliance was not concluded altogether without "conditions." The proof: The burning by the censor, in 1895, of the Marxian symposium, *Materials on the Problem of the Economic Development of Russia.*[171] If the literary agreement with the legal Marxists can be compared with a political alliance, then that book can be compared with a political treaty.

The rupture, of course, did not occur because the "allies" proved to be bourgeois democrats. On the contrary, the representatives of the latter tendency were the natural and desirable allies of the Social-Democrats in so far as their democratic tasks, that were brought to the front by the prevailing situation in Russia were concerned. But an essential condition for such an alliance must be complete liberty for Socialists to reveal to the working class that its interests are diametrically opposed to the interests of the bour-

* Reference is made here to an article by E. Tulin [Lenin] written against Struve, bearing the title "Marxism, as Reflected in Bourgeois Literature." [See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. I.—*Ed.*]

geoisie. However, the Bernsteinist and "critical" tendency to which the majority of the legal Marxists turned, deprived the Socialists of this liberty and corrupted Socialist consciousness by vulgarising Marxism, by preaching the toning down of social antagonisms, by declaring the idea of the social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat to be absurd, by restricting the labour movement and the class struggle to narrow trade unionism and to a "practical" struggle for petty, gradual reforms. This was tantamount to the bourgeois democrat's denial of Socialism's right to independence, and consequently, of its right to existence; in practice it meant a striving to convert the nascent labour movement into a tail of the liberals.

Naturally, under such circumstances a rupture was necessary. But the "peculiar" feature of Russia manifested itself in that this rupture simply meant the closing to the Social-Democrats of access to the most popular and widespread "legal" literature. The "ex-Marxists" who took up the flag of "criticism," and who obtained almost a monopoly in the "sale" of Marxism, entrenched themselves in this literature. Catchwords like: "Against orthodoxy" and "Long live freedom of criticism" (now repeated by *Rabocheye Dyelo*) immediately became the fashion, and the fact that neither the censor nor the gendarmes could resist this fashion is apparent from the publication of *three* Russian editions[172] of Bernstein's celebrated book (celebrated in the Herostratus sense) and from the fact that the books by Bernstein, Prokopovich and others were recommended by Zubatov [*Iskra,* No. 10].[173] And this tendency did not confine itself to the sphere of literature. The turn towards criticism was accompanied by the turn towards Economism that was taken by Social-Democratic practical workers.

The manner in which the contacts and mutual dependence between legal criticism and illegal Economism arose and grew, is an interesting subject in itself, and may very well be treated in a special article. It is sufficient to note here that these contacts undoubtedly existed. The notoriety deservedly acquired by the *Credo* was due precisely to the frankness with which it formulated these contacts and laid down the fundamental political tendencies of Economism, *viz.:* Let the workers carry on the economic struggle (it would be more correct to say the trade union struggle, because the latter embraces also specifically labour politics), and let the Marxist intelligentsia merge with the liberals for the political "struggle."

Thus, it turned out that trade union work "among the people" meant fulfilling the first part of this task, and legal criticism meant fulfilling the second part. This statement proved to be such an excellent weapon against Economism that, had there been no *Credo*, it would have been worth inventing.

The *Credo* was not invented, but it was published without the consent and perhaps even against the will of its authors. At all events the present writer, who was partly responsible for dragging this "programme" into the light of day * has heard complaints and reproaches to the effect that copies of the résumé of their views which were dubbed the *Credo* were distributed and even published in the press together with the protest! We refer to this episode because it reveals a very peculiar state of mind among our Economists, *viz.*, a fear of publicity. This feature is common among the Economists, and not among the authors of the *Credo* alone. It was revealed by that most outspoken and honest advocate of Economism, *Rabochaya Mysl*, and by *Rabocheye Dyelo* (which was indignant over the publication of Economist documents in the *Vademecum*), as well as by the Kiev Committee, which two years ago refused to permit the publication of its *profession de foi* * * together with a protest that had been written against it,*** and by many other individual representatives of Economism.[175]

This fear of criticism displayed by the advocates of freedom of criticism cannot be attributed solely to craftiness (although no doubt craftiness has something to do with it: It would be unwise to expose the young and as yet puny movement to the enemies' attack!) No, the majority of the Economists quite sincerely disapprove (and by the very nature of Economism they must disapprove) of all theoretical controversies, factional disagreements, of broad political questions, of schemes for organising revolutionaries, etc. "Leave all this sort of thing to the exiles abroad!" said a fairly consistent Economist to me one day, and thereby he expressed a very

* Reference is made here to the *Protest Signed by the Seventeen* against the *Credo*. The present writer took part in drawing up this protest (the end of 1899). The protest and the *Credo* were published abroad in the spring of 1900. [See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. II.—*Ed.*] It is now known from the article written by Madame Kuskova, I think in *Byloye* [*Past*] [174] that she was the author of the *Credo*, and that Mr. Prokopovich was very prominent among the Economists abroad at that time.

** Profession of faith.—*Ed.*

*** As far as we know the composition of the Kiev Committee has been changed since then.

widespread (purely trade unionist) view: Our business, he said, is the labour movement, the labour organisations, here, in our localities; all the rest are merely the inventions of doctrinaires, an "exaggeration of the importance of ideology," as the authors of the letter, published in *Iskra*, No. 12, expressed it in unison with *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10.

The question now arises: Seeing what the peculiar features of Russian "criticism" and Russian Bernsteinism were, what should those who desired, in deeds and not merely in words, to oppose opportunism have done? First of all, they should have made efforts to resume the theoretical work that was only just commenced in the period of legal Marxism, and that has now again fallen on the shoulders of the illegal workers. Unless such work is undertaken the successful growth of the movement is impossible. Secondly, they should have actively combated legal "criticism" that was corrupting people's minds. Thirdly, they should have actively counteracted the confusion and vacillation prevailing in practical work, and should have exposed and repudiated every conscious or unconscious attempt to degrade our programme and tactics.

That *Rabocheye Dyelo* did none of these things is a well-known fact, and further on, we shall deal with this well-known fact from various aspects. At the moment, however, we desire merely to show what a glaring contradiction there is between the demand for "freedom of criticism" and the peculiar features of our native criticism and Russian Economism. Indeed, glance at the text of the resolution by which the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad endorsed the point-of-view of *Rabocheye Dyelo*.

> In the interests of the further ideological development of Social-Democracy, we recognise the freedom to criticise Social-Democratic theory in party literature to be absolutely necessary in so far as this criticism does not run counter to the class and revolutionary character of this theory [*Two Congresses*, p. 10].

And what is the argument behind this resolution? The resolution "in its first part coincides with the resolution of the Luebeck Party Congress on Bernstein. . . ." In the simplicity of their souls the Leaguers failed to observe the *testimonium paupertatis* (certificate of mental poverty) they give themselves by this piece of imitativeness! . . . "But . . . in its second part, it restricts freedom of criticism much more than did the Luebeck Party Congress."

So the League's resolution was directed against the Russian

Bernsteinists? If it was not, then the reference to Luebeck is utterly absurd! But it is not true to say that it "restricts freedom of criticism." In passing their Hanover resolution, the Germans, point by point, rejected precisely *the amendments* proposed by Bernstein, while in their Luebeck resolution they cautioned *Bernstein personally*, and named him in the resolution. Our "free" imitators, however, *do not make a single reference to a single manifestation* of Russian "criticism" and Russian Economism, and in view of this omission, the bare reference to the class and revolutionary character of the theory, leaves exceedingly wide scope for misinterpretation, particularly when the League refuses to identify "so-called Economism" with opportunism [*Two Congresses*, p. 8]. But all this *en passant.* The important thing to note is that the opportunist attitude towards revolutionary Social-Democrats in Russia is the very opposite to that in Germany. In Germany, as we know, revolutionary Social-Democrats are in favour of preserving what is: They stand in favour of the old programme and tactics which are universally known, and after many decades of experience have become clear in all their details. The "critics" desire to introduce changes, and as these critics represent an insignificant minority, and as they are very shy and halting in their revisionist efforts, one can understand the motives of the majority in confining themselves to the dry rejection of "innovations." In Russia, however, it is the critics and Economists who are in favour of preserving what is: The "critics" wish us to continue to regard them as Marxists, and to guarantee them the "freedom of criticism" which they enjoyed to the full (for as a matter of fact they never recognised any kind of *party* ties *

* The absence of recognised party ties and party traditions by itself marks such a cardinal difference between Russia and Germany that it should have warned all sensible Socialists from being blindly imitative. But here is an example of the lengths to which "freedom of criticism" goes in Russia. Mr. Bulgakov, the Russian critic, utters the following reprimand to the Austrian critic, Hertz: "Notwithstanding the independence of his conclusions, Hertz, on this point [on co-operative societies] apparently remains tied by the opinions of his party, and although he disagrees with it in details, he dare not reject common principles" [*Capitalism and Agriculture*, Vol. II, p. 287]. The subject of a politically enslaved state, in which nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand of the population are corrupted to the marrow of their bones by political subservience and completely lack the conception of party honour and party ties, superciliously reprimands a citizen of a constitutional state for being excessively "tied by the opinion of his party"! Our illegal organisations have nothing else to do, of course, but draw up resolutions about freedom of criticism. . . .

and, moreover, we never had a generally recognised party organ which could "restrict" freedom of criticism even by friendly advice); the Economists want the revolutionaries to recognise "complete equality in the movement" [*Rabocheye Dyelo* No. 10, p. 25], *i. e.*, to recognise the "legitimacy" of what exists; they do not want the "ideologists" to try to "divert" the movement from the path that "is determined by the interaction of material elements and material environment" [Letter published in *Iskra*, No. 12]; they want recognition "for the only struggle that the workers can conduct under present conditions," which in their opinion is the struggle "which they are actually conducting at the present time" [Special Supplement to *Rabochaya Mysl*, p. 147]. We revolutionary Social-Democrats, on the contrary, are dissatisfied with this submission to elemental forces, *i. e.*, bowing to what is "at the present time"; we demand that the tactics that have prevailed in recent years be changed; we declare that "before we can unite, and in order that we may unite, we must first of all firmly and definitely draw the lines of demarcation between the various groups." (*See* announcement of the publication of *Iskra*.) * In a word, the Germans stand for what is and reject changes; we demand changes, and reject subservience to, and conciliation with, what is.

This "little" difference our "free" copyists of German resolutions failed to notice!

D. Engels on the Importance of the Theoretical Struggle

"Dogmatism, doctrinairism," "ossification of the party—the inevitable retribution that follows the violent strait-lacing of thought," these are the enemies against which the knightly champions of "freedom of criticism" are rallying their forces in *Rabocheye Dyelo*. We are very glad that this question has been brought up and we would propose only to add to it another question:

Who are to be the judges?

Before us lie two publishers' announcements. One, *The Programme of the Periodical Organ of the Russian Social-Democratic League—Rabocheye Dyelo* (Reprint from No. 1 of *Rabocheye Dyelo*),[176] and the other, *Announcement of the Resumption of Publication of Osvobozhdeniye Truda*.[177] Both are dated 1899, when

* See "Declaration by the Editorial Board of *Iskra*," p. 38, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

the "crisis of Marxism" had long been discussed. And what do we find? In the first production, we would seek in vain for any manifestation, or definite elucidation of the position the new organ intends to occupy. Of theoretical work and the urgent tasks that now confront it, not a word is said in this programme, nor in the supplements to it, that were passed by the Third Congress of the League in 1901 [*Two Congresses*, pp. 15-18]. During the whole of this time, the editorial board of *Rabocheye Dyelo* ignored theoretical questions, notwithstanding the fact that these questions excited the minds of Social-Democrats in all countries.

The other announcement, on the contrary, first of all points to the diminution of interest in theory observed in recent years, imperatively demands "vigilant attention to the theoretical aspect of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat," and calls for "ruthless criticism of the Bernsteinist and other anti-revolutionary tendencies in our movement. The issues of *Zarya* that have appeared show to what extent this programme was carried out.[178]

Thus we see that high-sounding phrases against the ossification of thought, etc., conceal carelessness and helplessness in the development of theoretical ideas. The case of the Russian Social-Democrats strikingly illustrates the fact observed in the whole of Europe (and long ago observed in German Marxism) that the notorious freedom of criticism implies, not the substitution of one theory by another, but freedom from every complete and thought-out theory; it implies eclecticism and absence of principle. Those who are in the least acquainted with the actual state of our movement cannot but see that the spread of Marxism was accompanied by a certain deterioration of theoretical standards. Quite a number of people, with very little, and even totally lacking in, theoretical training, joined the movement for the sake of its practical significance and its practical successes. We can judge, therefore, how tactless *Rabocheye Dyelo* is when, with an air of invincibility, it quotes the statement of Marx that: "A single step of the real movement is worth a dozen programmes."[179] To repeat these words in the epoch of theoretical chaos is sheer mockery. Moreover, these words of Marx are taken from his letter on the Gotha Programme, in which he *sharply condemns* eclecticism in the formulation of principles: "If you must combine," Marx wrote to the party leaders, "then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, but do not haggle over principles, do not make 'concessions' in theory." This

was Marx's idea, and yet there are people among us who strive—in his name!—to belittle the significance of theory.

Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism is combined with absorption in the narrowest forms of practical activity. The importance of theory for Russian Social-Democrats is still greater for three reasons, which are often forgotten:

The first is that our party is only in the process of formation, its features are only just becoming outlined, and it has not yet completely settled its reckoning with other tendencies in revolutionary thought which threaten to divert the movement from the proper path. Indeed, in very recent times we have observed (as Axelrod long ago warned the Economists would happen) a revival of non-Social-Democratic revolutionary tendencies.[180] Under such circumstances, what at first sight appears to be an "unimportant" mistake, may give rise to most deplorable consequences, and only the short-sighted would consider factional disputes and strict distinction of shades to be inopportune and superfluous. The fate of Russian Social-Democracy for many, many years to come may be determined by the strengthening of one or the other "shade."

The second reason is that the Social-Democratic movement is essentially an international movement. This does not mean merely that we must combat national chauvinism. It means also that a movement that is starting in a young country can be successful only on the condition that it assimilates the experience of other countries. In order to assimilate this experience, it is not sufficient merely to be acquainted with it, or simply to transcribe the latest resolutions. A critical attitude is required towards this experience, and ability to subject it to independent tests. Only those who realise how much the modern labour movement has grown in strength will understand what a reserve of theoretical forces and political (as well as revolutionary) experience is required to fulfil this task.

The third reason is that the national tasks of Russian Social-Democracy are such as have never confronted any other Socialist party in the world. Farther on we shall deal with the political and organisational duties which the task of emancipating the whole people from the yoke of autocracy imposes upon us. At the moment, we wish merely to state that the *rôle of vanguard can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by an advanced theory.* To

understand what this means concretely, let the reader call to mind the predecessors of Russian Social-Democracy like Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and the brilliant band of revolutionists of the seventies; let him ponder over the world significance which Russian literature is now acquiring, let him. . . . Oh! But that is enough!

We shall quote what Engels said in 1874 concerning the significance of theory in the Social-Democratic movement. Engels recognises *not two* forms of the great struggle Social-Democracy is conducting (political and economic), as is the fashion among us, *but three, adding to the first two also the theoretical struggle.* His recommendations to the German labour movement, which has now become practically and politically strong, are so instructive from the point of view of present-day controversies, that we hope the reader will forgive us for quoting a long passage from his Introduction to the *Peasant War in Germany,* which long ago became a literary rarity.

The German workers have two important advantages compared with the rest of Europe. First, they belong to the most theoretical people of Europe; second, they have retained that sense of theory which the so-called "educated" people of Germany have totally lost. Without German philosophy, particularly that of Hegel, German scientific Socialism (the only scientific Socialism extant) would never have come into existence. Without a sense for theory, scientific Socialism would have never become blood and tissue of the workers. What an enormous advantage this is, may be seen, on the one hand, from the indifference of the English labour movement towards all theory, which is one of the reasons why it moves so slowly, in spite of the splendid organisation of the individual unions; on the other hand, from the mischief and confusion created by Proudhonism in its original form among the Frenchmen and Belgians, and in its caricature form, as presented by Bakunin, among the Spaniards and Italians.

The second advantage is that, chronologically speaking, the Germans were the last to appear in the labour movement. In the same manner as German theoretical Socialism will never forget that it rests on the shoulders of Saint Simon, Fourier and Owen, the three who, in spite of their fantastic notions and Utopianism, belonged to the most significant heads of all time, and whose genius anticipated the correctness of which can now be proved in a scientific way, so the practical German labour movement must never forget that it has developed on the shoulders of the English and French movements, that it had utilised their experience, acquired at a heavy price, and that for this reason it was in a position to avoid their mistakes which in their time were unavoidable. Without the English trade unions and the French political workers' struggles preceding the German labour movement, without the mighty impulse given by the Paris Commune, where would we now be?

It must be said to the credit of the German workers that they have utilised the advantages of their situation with rare understanding. For the first time in the history of the labour movement, the struggle is being so conducted that its three sides, the theoretical, the political, and the practical economic

(resistance to the capitalists) form one harmonious and well-planned entity. In this concentric attack, as it were, lies the strength and invincibility of the German movement.

It is due to this advantageous situation on the one hand, to the insular peculiarities of the British, and to the cruel suppression of the French movements on the other, that for the present moment the German workers form the vanguard of the proletarian struggle. How long events will allow them to occupy this post of honour cannot be foreseen. But as long as they are placed in it, let us hope that they will discharge their duties in the proper manner. To this end it will be necessary to double our energies in all the spheres of struggle and agitation. It is the specific duty of the leaders to gain an ever-clearer understanding of the theoretical problems, to free themselves more and more from the influence of traditional phrases inherited from the old conception of the world, and constantly to keep in mind that Socialism, having become a science, demands the same treatment as every other science —it must be studied. The task of the leaders will be to bring understanding, thus acquired and clarified, to the working masses, to spread it with increased enthusiasm, to close the ranks of the party organisations and of the labour unions with ever-greater energy. . . .

If the German workers proceed in this way they may not march exactly at the head of the movement—it is not in the interest of the movement that the workers of one country should march at the head of all—but they will occupy an honourable place on the battle line, and they will stand armed for battle when other unexpected grave trials or momentous events will demand heightened courage, heightened determination, and the will to act.*

Engels' words proved prophetic. Within a few years, the German workers were subjected to severe trials in the form of the anti-Socialist laws; but they were fully armed to meet the situation, and succeeded in emerging from it victoriously.

The Russian workers will have to undergo trials immeasureably more severe; they will have to take up the fight against a monster, compared with which anti-Socialist laws in a constitutional country are but pigmies. History has now confronted us with an immediate task which is *more revolutionary than all the immediate tasks* that confront the proletariat of any other country. The fulfilment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark, not only of European, but also (it may now be said) of Asiatic reaction, places the Russian proletariat in the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat. We shall have the right to count upon acquiring the honourable title already earned by our predecessors, the revolutionaries of the seventies, if we succeed in inspiring our movement—which is a thousand times wider and deeper—with the same devoted determination and vigour.

* Third Edition, Leipzig, 1875. [English translation, pp. 27-30.—*Ed.*]

II

THE SPONTANEITY OF THE MASSES AND THE CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

We have said that our movement, much wider and deeper than the movement of the seventies, must be inspired with the same devoted determination and energy that inspired the movement at that time. Indeed, no one, we think, has up till now doubted that the strength of the modern movement lies in the awakening of the masses (principally, the industrial proletariat), and that its weakness lies in the lack of consciousness and initiative among the revolutionary leaders.

However, a most astonishing discovery has been made recently, which threatens to overthrow all the views that have hitherto prevailed on this question. This discovery was made by *Rabocheye Dyelo,* which, in its controversy with *Iskra* and *Zarya,* did not confine itself to making objections on separate points, but tried to ascribe "general disagreements" to a more profound cause—to the "disagreement concerning the estimation of the *relative* importance of the spontaneous and consciusly 'methodical' element." *Rabocheye Dyelo's* indictment reads: "*Belittling the importance of the objective, or spontaneous, element of development.*" * To this we say: If the controversy with *Iskra* and *Zarya* resulted in absolutely nothing more than causing *Rabocheye Dyelo* to think over these "general disagreements," that single result would give us considerable satisfaction, so important is this thesis, and so clearly does it illuminate the quintessence of the present-day theoretical and political differences that exist among Russian Social-Democrats.

That is why the question of the relation between consciousness and spontaneity is of such enormous general interest, and that is why this question must be dealt with in great detail.

A. The Beginning of the Spontaneous Movement

In the previous chapter, we pointed out how universally absorbed the educated youth of Russia were in the theories of Marxism in

* *Rabocheye Dyelo,* No. 10, 1901, pp. 17-18 [R. D.'s italics].

the middle of the nineties. The strikes that followed the famous St. Petersburg industrial war of 1896 also assumed a similar wholesale character. The fact that these strikes spread over the whole of Russia showed how deep the reviving popular movement was, and if we must speak of the "spontaneous element" then, of course, we must admit that this strike movement certainly bore a spontaneous character. But there is a difference between spontaneity and spontaneity. Strikes occurred in Russia in the seventies, and in the sixties (and also in the first half of the nineteenth century), and these strikes were accompanied by the "spontaneous" destruction of machinery, etc. Compared with these "revolts" the strikes of the nineties might even be described as "conscious," to such an extent do they mark the progress which the labour movement had made since that period. This shows that the "spontaneous element," in essence, represents nothing more nor less than consciousness in an *embryonic form.* Even the primitive rebellions expressed the awakening of consciousness to a certain extent: The workers abandoned their age-long faith in the permanence of the system which oppressed them. They began . . . I shall not say to understand, but to sense the necessity for collective resistance, and emphatically abandoned their slavish submission to their superiors. But all this was more in the nature of outbursts of desperation and vengeance than *struggle.* The strikes of the nineties revealed far greater flashes of consciousness: Definite demands were put forward, the time to strike was carefully chosen, known cases and examples in other places were discussed, etc. While the revolts were simply uprisings of the oppressed, the systematic strikes represented the class struggle in embryo, but only in embryo. Taken by themselves, these strikes were simple trade union struggles, but not yet Social-Democratic struggles. They testified to the awakening antagonisms between workers and employers, but the workers were not and could not be conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system, *i. e.,* it was not yet Social-Democratic consciousness. In this sense, the strikes of the nineties, in spite of the enormous progress they represented as compared with the "revolts," represented a purely spontaneous movement.

We said that *there could not yet be* Social-Democratic consciousness among the workers. This consciousness could only be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the

working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness, *i. e.*, it may itself realise the necessity for combining in unions, to fight against the employers and to strive to compel the government to pass necessary labour legislation, etc.*

The theory of Socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical and economic theories that were elaborated by the educated representatives of the propertied classes, the intellectuals. The founders of modern scientific Socialism, Marx and Engels, themselves belonged to the bourgeois intelligentsia. Similarly, in Russia, the theoretical doctrine of Social-Democracy arose quite independently of the spontaneous growth of the labour movement; it arose as a natural and inevitable outcome of the development of ideas among the revolutionary Socialist intelligentsia. At the time of which we are speaking, *i. e.*, the middle of the nineties, this doctrine not only represented the completely formulated programme of the Emancipation of Labour group but had already won the adhesion of the majority of the revolutionary youth in Russia.

Hence, simultaneously we had both the spontaneous awakening of the masses of the workers—the awakening to conscious life and struggle, and the striving of the revolutionary youth, armed with the Social-Democratic theories, to reach the workers. In this connection it is particularly important to state the oft-forgotten (and comparatively little-known) fact that the early Social-Democrats of that period, *zealously carried on economic agitation* (being guided in this by the really useful instructions contained in the pamphlet *Agitation* that was still in manuscript) [181] but they did not regard this as their sole task. On the contrary, *right from the very beginning* they brought up the general historical tasks of Russian Social-Democracy, and particularly the task of overthrowing the autocracy. For example, the St. Petersburg group of Social-Democrats, which was formed by the League of the Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class towards the end of 1895, got out the first number of the journal known as *Rabocheye Dyelo.* This number was completely ready for the press when it was seized by the gendarmes who, on the night of December 8, 1895, raided

* Trade Unionism does not exclude "politics" altogether as some imagine. Trade unions have always conducted political agitation and struggle (but not Social-Democratic ones). We shall deal with the difference between trade union politics and Social-Democratic politics in the next chapter.

the house of one of the members of the group, Anatole Alekseyevich Vaneyev,* and so the original *Rabocheye Dyelo* was not fated to see the light. The leading article in this number (which perhaps in thirty years' time some *Russkaya Starina* [*Russian Antiquary*] will discover in the archives of the Department of Police) [182] described the historic tasks of the working class in Russia, of which the achievement of political liberty is regarded as the most important. This number also contained an article entitled, "What Are Our Cabinet Ministers Thinking Of?" which dealt with the wrecking of the premises of the elementary education committees by the police. In addition, there was some correspondence, from St. Petersburg, as well as from other parts of Russia (for example a letter on the shooting down of the workers in the Yaroslav province).[183] This, if we are not mistaken, "first attempt" of the Russian Social-Democrats of the nineties was not a narrow, local, and certainly not an "economic" newspaper, but one that aimed to unite the strike movement with the revolutionary movement against the autocracy, and to win all the victims of oppression and political and reactionary obscurantism over to the side of the Social-Democracy. No one in the slightest degree acquainted with the state of the movement at that period could doubt that such a paper would have been fully approved of by the workers of the capital and the revolutionary intelligentsia and would have had a wide circulation. The failure of the enterprise merely showed that the Social-Democrats of that time were unable to meet the immediate requirements of the time owing to their lack of revolutionary experience and practical training. The same thing must be said with regard to the St. Petersburg *Rabochy Listok* (*Workers' Leaflet*) [185] and particularly with regard to the *Rabochaya Gazeta* and *Manifesto* established in the spring of 1898 by the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. Of course, we would not dream of blaming the Social-Democrats of that time for this unpreparedness. But in order to obtain the benefit of the experience of that movement, and to learn practical lessons from it, we must thoroughly understand the causes and significance of this or that shortcoming. For that reason

* A. A. Vaneyev died in eastern Siberia in 1899, from consumption, which he contracted as a result of his solitary confinement in prison prior to his banishment. That is why we are able to publish the above information, the authenticity of which we guarantee, for it comes from persons who were closely and directly acquainted with A. A. Vaneyev.[184]

it is extremely important to establish the fact that part (perhaps even a majority) of the Social-Democrats operating in the period of 1895-1898, quite justly considered it possible even then, at the very beginning of the "spontaneous movement," to come forward with a most extensive programme and fighting tactics.*

The lack of training of the majority of the revolutionists being quite a natural phenomenon, could not have aroused any particular fears. Since the tasks were properly defined, since the energy existed for repeated attempts to fulfil these tasks, the temporary failures were not such a great misfortune. Revolutionary experience and organisational skill are things that can be acquired provided the desire is there to acquire these qualities, provided the shortcomings are recognised—which in revolutionary activity is more than half-way towards removing them!

It was a great misfortune, however, when this consciousness began to grow dim (it was very lively among the workers in the group mentioned), when people appeared—and even Social-Democratic organs—who were prepared to regard shortcomings as virtues, who tried even to put a *theoretical* basis to *slavish cringing before spontaneity*. It is time to summarise this tendency, the substance of which is incorrectly and too narrowly described as Economism.

B. Bowing to Spontaneity
Rabochaya Mysl

Before dealing with the literary manifestation of this subservience, we would like to mention the following characteristic fact (communicated to us from the above-mentioned source), which throws

* *Iskra*, which adopts a hostile attitude towards the activities of the Social-Democrats of the end of the nineties, ignores the fact that at that time the conditions were unfavourable for any other kind of work except fighting for petty demands, declare the Economists in their Letter to Russian Social-Democratic Organs [*Iskra*, No. 12]. The facts quoted above show that the statement about "unfavourable conditions" *is diametrically opposite to the truth*. Not only at the end, but even in the middle of the nineties, all the conditions existed *for other* work, besides fighting for petty demands, all the conditions—except the sufficient training of the leaders. Instead of frankly admitting our, the ideologists', the leaders', lack of sufficient training—the Economists try to throw the blame entirely upon "the absence of conditions," upon the influence of material environment which determined the road from which it was impossible to divert the movement by any kind of ideology. What is this but slavish cringing before spontaneity, but the fact that the "ideologists" are enamoured of their own shortcomings?

some light on circumstances of the rise and growth of two diverging Russian Social-Democratic tendencies among the comrades working in St. Petersburg. In the beginning of 1897, just prior to their banishment, A. A. Vaneyev and several of his comrades, attended a private meeting at which the "old" and "young" members of the League of the Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class were gathered. The conversation centred chiefly around the question of organisation, and particularly around the "rules for a workers' benefit club," which, in their final form, were published in *Listok Rabotnika*—[*Workers' Leaflet*] Nos. 9-10, p. 46.[186] Sharp differences were immediately revealed between the "old" members (the "Decembrists," as the St. Petersburg Social-Democrats jestingly called them) and several of the "young" members (who subsequently took an active part in the work of *Rabochaya Mysl*), the divergences were very great and a very heated discussion ensued. The "young" members defended the main principles of the rules in the form in which they were published. The "old" members said that this was not what was wanted: That first of all it was necessary to consolidate the League of the Struggle into an organisation of revolutionaries which should have control of all the various workers' benefit clubs, students' propaganda circles, etc. It goes without saying that the controversialists had no suspicion at that time that these disagreements were the beginning of a wide divergence; on the contrary they regarded them as being of an isolated and casual nature.[187] But this fact shows that Economism did not arise and spread in Russia without a fight on the part of the "old" Social-Democrats (the Economists of to-day are apt to forget this). And if this struggle has not left "documentary" traces behind it, it is *solely* because the membership of the circles working at that time underwent such constant change that no continuity was established and consequently, differences were not recorded in any documents.

The appearance of *Rabochaya Mysl* brought Economism to the light of day, but not all at once. We must picture to ourselves concretely the conditions of the work and the short-livedness of the majority of the Russian circles (and only those who have experienced this can have any exact idea of it), in order to understand how much there was accidental in the successes and failures of the new tendency in various towns, and why for a long time neither the advocates nor the opponents of this "new" tendency could make up their minds, indeed they had no opportunity to do

so—as to whether this was really a new tendency or whether it was merely an expression of the lack of training of certain individuals. For example, the first mimeographed copies of *Rabochaya Mysl* never reached the great majority of Social-Democrats, and we are able to refer to the leading article in the first number [188] only because it was reproduced in an article by V. I. [*Listok Rabotnika*, Nos. 9-10, p. 47*ff.*],[189] who, of course, did not fail zealously, but unreasonably to extol the new paper, which was so different from the papers and the schemes for papers mentioned above.* And this leading article deserves to be dealt with in detail because it so strongly expresses *the spirit* of *Rabochaya Mysl* and Economism generally.

After referring to the fact that the arm of the "blue-coats" could never stop the progress of the labour movement, the leading article goes on to say: ". . . The virility of the labour movement is due to the fact that the workers themselves are at last taking their fate in their own hands, and out of the hands of the leaders," and this fundamental thesis is then developed in greater detail. As a matter of fact the leaders(*i. e.*, the Social-Democrats, the organisers of the League of the Struggle) were, one might say, torn out of the hands of the workers by the police; ** yet it is made to appear that the workers were fighting against the leaders and eventually liberated themselves from their yoke! Instead of calling upon the workers to go forward towards the consolidation of the revolutionary organisations, and to the expansion of political activity, they began to call for a *regress* to the purely trade-union struggle. They announced that "the economic basis of the movement is eclipsed by the effort never to forget the political ideal," and that the watchword for the movement was "Fight for an economic position" (!) or to go even one better, "the workers for the workers." It was declared

* It should be stated in passing that the praise of *Rabochaya Mysl* in November, 1898, when Economism had become fully defined, especially abroad, emanated from that same V. I., who, very soon after, became one of the editors of *Rabocheye Dyelo*. And yet *Rabocheye Dyelo* denied that there were two tendencies in Russian Social-Democracy, and continues to deny it to this day.

** That this simile is a correct one is shown by the following characteristic fact. When, after the arrest of the "Decembrists," the news was spread among the workers on the Schluesselburg Road that the discovery and arrest was facilitated by an agent provocateur, N. N. Mikhailov, a dental surgeon, who had been in contact with a group associated with the "Decembrists," they were so enraged that they decided to kill him.

that strike funds "are more valuable for the movement than 100 other organisations." (Compare this statement made in 1897 with the controversy between the "Decembrists" and the young members in the beginning of 1897.) Catch-words like: "We must concentrate, not on the 'cream' of the workers, but on the 'average' worker —the mass worker"; "Politics always obediently follow economics," * etc., etc., became the fashion, and exercised irresistible influence upon the masses of the youth who were attracted to the movement, but who, in the majority of cases, were acquainted only with legally expounded fragments of Marxism.

Consciousness was completely overwhelmed by spontaneity—the spontaneity of the "Social-Democrats" who repeated V. V.'s "ideas," the spontaneity of those workers who were carried away by the arguments that a kopeck added to a ruble was worth more than Socialism and politics, and that they must "fight, knowing that they are fighting not for some future generations, but for themselves and their children." [Leading article in *Rabochaya Mysl*, No. 1.] Phrases like these have always been the favourite weapons of the Western European bourgeoisie, who, while hating Socialism, strove (like the German "Sozial-Politiker" Hirsch) to transplant English trade unionism to their own soil, and to preach to the workers that the purely trade-union struggle is the struggle for their own and their children's welfare, and not a struggle for some kind of Socialism that will be realised only in the very remote future.** And now the "V. V.'s, of Russian Social-Democracy" repeat these bourgeois phrases. It is important at this point to note three circumstances, which will be useful to us in our further analysis of *contemporary* differences.***

* These quotations are taken from the leading article, in the first number of *Rabochaya Mysl* already referred to. One can judge from this, the degree of theoretical training possessed by these "V. V.'s of Russian Social-Democracy," [190] who kept repeating the crude vulgarisations of "economic materialism" at a time when the Marxists were carrying on a literary war against the real V. V. who had long ago been dubbed "a past master of reactionary deeds" for holding *similar* views on the relation between politics and economics!

** The Germans even have a special expression: *Nur Gewerkschaftler*, which means an advocate of the "pure and simple" trade-union struggle.

*** We emphasise the word *contemporary* for the benefit of those who may pharisaically shrug their shoulders and say: It is easy enough to attack *Rabochaya Mysl* now, but is not all this ancient history? *Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur* [Change the name and the tale refers to you.—*Ed.*], we reply to such contemporary pharisees whose complete mental subjection to *Rabochaya Mysl* will be *proved* farther on.

First of all, the overwhelming of consciousness by spontaneity to which we referred above, also took place *spontaneously*. This may sound like a pun, but alas, it is the bitter truth. It did not take place as a result of an open struggle between two diametrically opposed points-of-view, in which one gained the victory over the other; it occurred because an increasing number of "old" revolutionaries were "torn away" by the gendarmes, and because increasing numbers of "young" members and "V. V.'s of Russian Social-Democracy" came upon the scene. Every one, who I shall not say has participated in the *contemporary* Russian movement, but who has at least breathed its atmosphere, knows perfectly well that this was so. And the reason why we, nevertheless, strongly urge the reader to ponder well this universally known fact, and why we quote the facts, as an illustration, so to speak, about the *Rabocheye Dyelo* as it first appeared, and about the controversy between the "old" and the "young" at the beginning of 1897, is that certain persons are speculating on the public's (or the very youthful youth's) ignorance of these facts, and are boasting of their "democracy." We shall return to this point farther on.

Secondly, in the very first literary manifestation of Economism, we observe the extremely curious and highly characteristic phenomenon—from the point-of-view of the differences prevailing among contemporary Social-Democrats—that the adherents of the "pure and simple" labour movement, the worshippers of the closest "organic" (the term used by *Rabocheye Dyelo*) contacts with the proletarian struggle, the opponents of the non-labour intelligentsia (notwithstanding that it is a Socialist intelligentsia) are compelled, in order to defend their positions, to resort to the arguments of the *bourgeois* "pure and simple" trade unionists. This shows that right from the outset, *Rabochaya Mysl* began unconsciously to carry out the programme of the *Credo*. This shows (what the *Rabocheye Dyelo* cannot understand) that subservience to the spontaneity of the labour movement, the belittling of the rôle of "the conscious element," of the rôle of Social-Democracy, *means, whether one likes it or not, growth of influence of bourgeois ideology among the workers.* All those who talk about "exaggerating the importance of ideology," * about exaggerating the rôle of the conscious elements,** etc., imagine that the pure and simple labour movement

* Letter by the Economists, in *Iskra*, No. 12.
** *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10.

can work out an independent ideology for itself, if only the workers "take their fate out of the hands of the leaders." But in this they are profoundly mistaken. To supplement what has been said above, we shall quote the following profoundly true and important utterances by Karl Kautsky on the new programme of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party.*

Many of our revisionist critics believe that Marx asserted that economic development and the class struggle create, not only the conditions for Socialist production, but also, and directly, the *consciousness* (K. K.'s italics) of its necessity. And these critics advance the argument that the most highly capitalistically developed country, England, is more remote than any other from this consciousness. Judging from the draft, one must come to the conclusion that the committee which drafted the Austrian Programme shared this alleged orthodox-Marxian view which is thus refuted. In the draft programme it is stated: "The more capitalist development increases the numbers of the proletariat, the more the proletariat is compelled, and obtains the opportunity to fight against capitalism." The proletariat becomes "conscious" of the possibility and necessity for Socialism. In this connection Socialist consciousness is represented as a necessary and direct result of the proletarian class struggle. But this is absolutely untrue. Of course, Socialism, as a theory, has its roots in modern economic relationships in the same way as the class struggle of the proletariat has, and in the same way as the latter emerges from the struggle against the capitalist-created poverty and misery of the masses. But Socialism and the class struggle arise side by side and not one out of the other; each arises out of different premises. Modern Socialist consciousness can arise only on the basis of profound scientific knowledge. Indeed, modern economic science is as much a condition for Socialist production, as, say, modern technology, and the proletariat can create neither the one nor the other, no matter how much it may desire to do so; both arise out of the modern social process. The vehicles of science are not the proletariat, but the *bourgeois intelligentsia* (K. K.'s italics): It was out of the heads of members of this stratum that modern Socialism originated, and it was they who communicated it to the more intellectually developed proletarians who, in their turn, introduce it into the proletarian class struggle where conditions allow that to be done. Thus, Socialist consciousness is something introduced into the proletarian class struggle from without (*von Aussen Hineingetragenes*), and not something that arose within it spontaneously (*urwüchsig*). Accordingly, the old Hainfeld programme quite rightly stated that the task of Social-Democracy is to imbue the proletariat with the *consciousness* of its position and the consciousness of its tasks. There would be no need for this if consciousness emerged from the class struggle. The new draft copied this postulate from the old programme, and attached it to the postulate mentioned above. But this completely broke the line of thought. . . .

Since there can be no talk of an independent ideology being developed by the masses of the workers in the process of their move-

* *Neue Zeit*, 1901-1902, XX, I, No. 3, p. 79. The committee's draft to which Kautsky refers was passed by the Vienna Congress at the end of last year in a slightly amended form.[191]

ment * then *the only choice is:* Either bourgeois, or Socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for humanity has not created a "third" ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or above-class ideology). Hence, to belittle Socialist ideology *in any way*, to *deviate from it in the slightest degree* means strengthening bourgeois ideology. There is a lot of talk about spontaneity, but the *spontaneous* development of the labour movement leads to its becoming subordinated to bourgeois ideology, it means developing *according to the programme* of the *Credo*, for the spontaneous labour movement is pure and simple trade unionism, is *Nur-Gewerkschaftlerei*, and trade unionism means the ideological subordination of the workers to the bourgeoisie. Hence, our task, the task of Social-Democracy, is to *combat spontaneity*, to *divert* the labour movement, with its spontaneous trade-unionist striving, from under the wing of the bourgeoisie, and to bring it under the wing of revolutionary Social-Democracy. The phrases employed by the authors of the "Economic" letter in *Iskra*, No. 12, about the efforts of the most inspired ideologists not being able to divert the labour movement from the path that is determined by the interaction of the material elements and the material environment *are tantamount to the abandonment of Socialism*, and if only the authors of this letter fearlessly thought out what they say to its logical conclusion, as every one who enters into the arena of literary and public activity should do, they would have nothing else to do but "fold their useless arms over their empty breasts" and . . . leave the field of action to the Struves and Prokopoviches who are dragging the labour movement "along the line of least resistance," *i. e.*, along the line of bourgeois trade

* This does not mean, of course, that the workers have no part in creating such an ideology. But they take part not as workers, but as Socialist theoreticians, like Proudhon and Weitling; in other words, they take part only to the extent that they are able, more or less, to acquire the knowledge of their age and advance that knowledge. And in order that working men *may be able to do this more often*, efforts must be made to raise the level of the consciousness of the workers generally; care must be taken that the workers do not confine themselves to the artificially restricted limits of *literature for workers* but that they study *general literature* to an increasing degree. It would even be more true to say "were not confined," instead of "not confine themselves," because the workers themselves wish to read and do read all that is written for the intelligentsia and it is only a few (bad) intellectuals who believe that it is sufficient "for the workers" to tell them a few things about factory conditions, and to repeat over and over again what has long been known.

unionism, or to the Zubatovs who are dragging it along the line of clerical and gendarme "ideology."

Recall the example of Germany. What was the historical service Lassalle rendered to the German labour movement? It was that he *diverted* that movement from the path of progressive trade unionism and co-operation, along which it was travelling spontaneously (*with the benign assistance of Schulze-Delitzsch and those like him*). To fulfil a task like that, it is necessary to do something altogether different from indulging in talk about belittling the spontaneous element, about the tactics-process and about the interaction between elements and environment, etc. *A desperate struggle against spontaneity had to be carried on,* and only after such a struggle, extending over many years, was it possible to convert the working population of Berlin from a bulwark of the Progressive Party into one of the finest strongholds of Social-Democracy. This fight is not finished even now (as those who study the history of the German movement from Prokopovich,[192] and its philosophy from Struve believe).[193] Even now the German working class is, so to speak, broken up into a number of ideologies. A section of the workers is organised in Catholic and Monarchist labour unions; another section is organised in the Hirsch-Duncker unions,[194] founded by the bourgeois worshippers of English trade unionism, while a third section is organised in Social-Democratic trade unions. The latter is immeasurably more numerous than the rest, but Social-Democracy was able to achieve this superiority and will be able to maintain it, only by unswervingly fighting against all other ideologies.

But why, the reader will ask, does the spontaneous movement, the movement along the line of least resistance, lead to the domination of bourgeois ideology? For the simple reason that bourgeois ideology is far older in origin than Social-Democratic ideology; because it is more fully developed and because it possesses *immeasurably* more opportunities for becoming widespread.* And

* It is often said: The working class *spontaneously* gravitates towards Socialism. This is perfectly true in the sense that Socialist theory defines the causes of the poverty of the working class more profoundly and more correctly than any other theory, and for that reason the workers are able to appreciate it so easily, *provided,* however, that this theory does not step aside for spontaneity and *provided* it subordinates spontaneity to itself. Usually this is taken for granted, but *Rabocheye Dyelo* forgets or distorts this obvious thing. The working class spontaneously gravitates towards Socialism,

the younger the Socialist movement is in any given country, the more vigorously must it fight against all attempts to entrench non-Socialist ideology, and the more strongly must it warn the workers against those bad counsellors who shout against "exaggerating the conscious elements," etc. The authors of the Economic Letter, in unison with *Rabocheye Dyelo*, declaim against the intolerance that is characteristic of the infancy of the movement. To this we reply: Yes, our movement is indeed in its infancy, and in order that it may grow up the quicker, it must become infected with intolerance against all those who retard its growth by subservience to spontaneity. Nothing is so ridiculous and harmful as pretending that we are "old hands" who have long ago experienced all the decisive episodes of the struggle!

Thirdly, the first number of *Rabochaya Mysl* shows that the term "Economism" (which, of course, we do not propose to abandon because it has more or less established itself) does not adequately convey the real character of the new tendency. *Rabochaya Mysl* does not altogether repudiate the political struggle: The Benefit Society constitution, published in *Rabochaya Mysl*, No. 1, contains a reference to fighting against the government. *Rabochaya Mysl* believes, however, that "politics always obediently follow economics" (and *Rabocheye Dyelo* gives a variation of this thesis when, in its programme it asserts that "in Russia more than in any other country, the economic struggle is *inseparable* from the political struggle"). *If by politics is meant Social-Democratic politics*, then the postulates advanced by *Rabochaya Mysl* and *Rabocheye Dyelo* are wrong. The economic struggle of the workers is very often connected with (although not inseparable from) bourgeois politics, clerical politics, etc., as we have already seen. If by politics is meant trade-union politics, *i. e.*, the common striving of all workers to secure from the government measures for the alleviation of their distress, measures characteristic of their position, but which do not altogether change that position, *i. e.*, which do not remove the subjection of labour to capital, then *Rabocheye Dyelo's* postulate is correct. That striving indeed is common to the British trade unionists, who are hostile to Socialism, to the Catholic workers, to the "Zubatov" workers, etc. There are politics and politics. We see,

nevertheless, the more widespread (and continuously revived in the most diverse forms) bourgeois ideology imposes itself spontaneously upon the working class more than any other.

therefore, that *Rabochaya Mysl* does not so much deny the political struggle as bow to its *spontaneity*, to its lack of purpose. While recognising the political struggle (it would be more correct to say: the political desires and demands of the workers), which arises spontaneously from the labour movement itself, it absolutely refuses *independently to work out* a specifically *Social-Democratic policy* corresponding to the general tasks of Socialism and to contemporary conditions in Russia. Farther on we shall show that *Rabocheye Dyelo* commits the same error.

C. The Self-Emancipation Group and *Rabocheye Dyelo*

We have dealt at such length with the little-known and now almost forgotten leading article in the first number of *Rabochaya Mysl* because it was the first and most striking expression of that general stream of thought which afterwards found the light of day in innumerable streamlets. V. I. was absolutely right when, in praising the first number and the leading article of *Rabochaya Mysl*, he said that it was written in a "sharp and provocative" style [*Listok Rabochevo*, Nos. 9-10, p. 49]. Every man with convictions, who thinks he has something new to say, writes "provocatively" and expresses his views strongly. Only those who are accustomed to sit between two stools lack "provocativeness"; only such people are able to praise the provocativeness of *Rabochaya Mysl* one day, and attack the "provocative polemics" of its opponents the next.

We shall not dwell on the Special Supplement to *Rabochaya Mysl* (below we shall have occasion on a number of points to refer to this work, which expresses the ideas of the Economists more consistently than any other) but shall briefly mention the *Manifesto of the Self-Emancipation of the Workers' Group* [March, 1899, reprinted in the London *Nakanunye* [*On the Eve*], No. 7, June, 1899].[195] The authors of this manifesto quite rightly say that "the workers of Russia *are only just awakening*, are only just looking around, and *instinctively clutch at the first means of struggle that come to their hands.*" But from this correct observation, they draw the same incorrect conclusion that is drawn by *Rabochaya Mysl*, forgetting that instinct is that unconsciousness (spontaneity) to whose aid the Socialists must come; that the "first means of struggle that come to their hands" will always be in modern society, the trade union means of struggle, and the "first ideology that comes to hand" will

be bourgeois (trade union) ideology. Similarly, these authors do not "repudiate" politics, they merely say (merely!), repeating what was said by V. V., that politics are the superstructure, and therefore, "political agitation must be the superstructure to the agitation carried on in favour of the economic struggle; it must arise on the basis of this struggle and give precedence to it."

As for *Rabocheye Dyelo,* it commenced its activity by "a defence" of the Economists. It uttered *a downright untruth* in its very first number [No. 1, pp. 141-142][196] when it stated that it "did not know which young comrades Axelrod referred to" in his well-known pamphlet, in which he uttered a warning against the Economists.* In the controversy that flared up with Axelrod and Plekhanov over this falsehood, *Rabocheye Dyelo* was compelled to admit that "by expressing ignorance, it desired to *defend* all the younger Social-Democrats abroad from this unjust accusation" (Axelrod accused the Economists of having a restricted outlook). As a matter of fact this accusation was absolutely just, and *Rabocheye Dyelo* knows perfectly well that, among others, it applied to V. I., a member of its editorial staff. We shall observe in passing that in this controversy Axelrod was absolutely right, and *Rabocheye Dyelo* was absolutely wrong, in their respective interpretations of my pamphlet: *The Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats.*** That pamphlet was written in 1897, before the appearance of *Rabochaya Mysl* when I thought, and rightly thought, that the *original* tendency of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle, which I described above, was the predominant one. At all events, that tendency was the predominant one until the middle of 1898.[197] Consequently, in its attempt to refute the existence and dangers of Economism, *Rabocheye Dyelo* had no right whatever to refer to a pamphlet which expressed views that were *squeezed out* by Economist views in St. Petersburg in 1897-1898.***

* *The Contemporary Tasks and Tactics of the Russian Social-Democrats,* Geneva, 1898. Two letters written to *Rabochaya Gazeta* in 1897.

** See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. II.—*Ed.*

*** In its attempt to justify the first untruth it uttered ("we do not know which young comrades Axelrod referred to") *Rabocheye Dyelo* uttered a second, when, in its *Reply* it wrote: "Since the review of *The Tasks* was published, a tendency has arisen, or has become more or less defined among certain Russian Social-Democrats, towards economic one-sidedness, which represents a step backwards from the state of our movement as described in *The Tasks*" [p. 9]. This is what the *Reply* says, *published in 1900.* But the first number of *Rabocheye Dyelo* (containing the review) appeared *in*

But *Rabocheye Dyelo* not only "defended" the Economists—it itself constantly fell into fundamental Economist errors. The cause of these errors is to be found in the ambiguity of the interpretation given to the following thesis in *Rabocheye Dyelo's* programme: "We consider that the most important phenomenon of Russian life, the one that will mostly *determine the tasks* [our italics] and the character of the literary activity of the league, is the *mass labour movement* [*Rabocheye Dyelo's* italics] that has arisen in recent years." That the mass movement is a most important phenomenon is a fact about which there can be no dispute. But the crux of the question is, What is the meaning of the phrase: The labour movement will "determine the tasks"? It may be interpreted in one of two ways. *Either* it means subservience to the spontaneity of this movement, *i. e.*, reducing the rôle of Social-Democracy to mere subservience to the labour movement as such (the interpretation given to it by *Rabochaya Mysl*, the Self-Emancipation group and other Economists); *or* it may mean that the mass movement sets before us *new*, theoretical, political and organisational tasks, far more complicated than those that might have satisfied us in the period before the rise of the mass movement. *Rabocheye Dyelo* inclined and still inclines towards the first interpretation, for it said nothing definitely about new tasks, but argued all the time as if the "mass movement" *relieved* us of the necessity of clearly appreciating and fulfilling the tasks it sets before us. We need only point out that *Rabocheye Dyelo* considered that we could not possibly accept the overthrow of the autocracy as the *first* task of the mass labour movement, and that it degraded this task (ostensibly in the interests of the mass movement) to the struggle for immediate political demands. [*Reply*, p. 25.]

We shall pass over the article by B. Krichevsky, the editor of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, entitled "The Economic and Political Struggle in the Russian Movement," published in No. 7, of that paper, in which these very mistakes are repeated * and take up *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10.

April, 1899. Did Economism arise only in 1899? No. The protest of the *Russian* Social-Democrats against Economism (the protest against the *Credo*) appeared in 1899. Economism arose in 1897, as *Rabocheye Dyelo* very well knows, for *already in November, 1898*, V. I. praised *Rabochaya Mysl*, in *Listok Rabochevo*, Nos. 9-10.

* The "stages theory," or the theory of "timid zigzags" in the political struggle, is expressed in this article approximately in the following way:

We shall not, of course, enter in detail into the various objections raised by B. Krichevsky and Martynov against *Zarya* and *Iskra*. What interests us here solely, is the theoretical position taken up by *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10. For example, we shall not examine the literary curiosity, that *Rabocheye Dyelo* saw a "diametrical" contradiction between the postulate:

> Social-Democracy does not tie its hands, it does not restrict its activities to some preconceived plan or method of political struggle: It recognises all methods of struggle, as long as they correspond to the forces at the disposal of the party . . . under the given conditions, etc. [*Iskra*, No. 1].*

and the postulate:

> Without a strong organisation, tested in the political struggle carried on under all circumstances and in all periods, there can be no talk of a systematic plan of activity, enlightened by firm principles and unswervingly carried out, which alone is worthy of being called tactics [*Iskra*, No. 4].**

To confuse the recognition, *in principle*, of all means of struggle, of all plans and methods, provided they are expedient—with the necessity *at a given political moment*, to be guided by a strictly

"Political demands, which in their character are common to the whole of Russia should, however, at first [this was written in August, 1900!] correspond to the experience gained by the given stratum [*sic!*] of workers in the economic struggle. Only [!] on the basis of this experience can and should the political agitation be taken up," etc. [p. 11]. On page 4, the author, protesting against what he regards as the absolutely unfounded charge of Economist heresy, pathetically exclaims: "What Social-Democrat does not know that according to the theories of Marx and Engels, the class interest is the decisive factor in history, and, *consequently*, that the proletarian struggle for the defence of its economic interests must be of first-rate importance in its class development and struggle for emancipation?" (our italics). The word "consequently" is absolutely out of place. The fact that economic interests are a decisive factor *does not in the least imply* that the economic (*i. e.*, trade union) struggle must be the main factor, for the essential and "decisive" interest of classes can be satisfied *only* by radical *political* changes. In particular the fundamental economic interests of the proletariat can be satisfied only by a political revolution, that will substitute the dictatorship of the proletariat for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. B. Krichevsky repeats the arguments of the "V. V.'s of Russian Social-Democracy" (*i. e.*, politics follow economics, etc., and the Bernsteinists of German Social-Democracy (for example, by arguments like these, Woltmann tried to prove that the workers must first of all acquire "economic power" before they can think about political revolution).[198]

* See conclusion of article, "The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement," p. 57, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

** See beginning of article "Where to Begin," p. 109, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

adhered to plan in talking of tactics, is tantamount to confusing the recognition by medical science of all kinds of treatment of diseases with the necessity for adopting a certain definite method of treatment for a given disease. The point is, however, that *Rabocheye Dyelo*, while suffering from a disease which we have called subservience to spontaneity, refuses to recognise any "method of treatment" for *that* disease. Hence, it made the remarkable discovery that "a plan of tactics contradicts the fundamental spirit of Marxism" [No. 10, p. 18], that tactics are "*a process of growth of party tasks, which grow with the party*" [(p. 11), *Rabocheye Dyelo's* italics]. The latter remark has every chance of becoming a celebrated maxim, a permanent monument to the tendency of *Rabocheye Dyelo.* To the question: *Whither?* a leading organ replies: Motion is a process of alteration in the distance between starting point and destination. This matchless example of profundity is not merely a literary curiosity (if it were, it would not be worth dealing with at length), but *the programme of the whole tendency, i. e.*, the programme which R. M. (in the Special Supplement to *Rabochaya Mysl*) expressed in the words: "That struggle is desirable which is possible, and the struggle which is possible is the one that is going on now." It is the tendency of unbounded opportunism, which passively adapts itself to spontaneity.

"A plan of tactics contradicts the fundamental spirit of Marxism!" But this is a libel on Marxism; it is like the caricature of it that was presented to us by the Narodniks in their fight against us. It means putting restraint on the initiative and energy of class-conscious fighters, whereas Marxism on the contrary, gives a gigantic impetus to the initiative and energy of Social-Democrats, opens up for them the widest perspectives and, if one may so express it, places at their disposal the mighty force of millions and millions of workers "spontaneously" rising for the struggle. The whole history of international Social-Democracy seethes with plans advanced first by one and then by another political leader; some confirming the far-sightedness and correct political and organisational insight of their authors and others revealing their short-sightedness and lack of political judgment. At the time when Germany was passing one of the most important turning points in its history—the time of the establishment of the Empire, the opening of the Reichstag, and the granting of universal suffrage, Liebknecht had one plan for Social-Democratic policy and work, and Schweitzer had another.

When the anti-Socialist laws came down on the heads of the German Socialists, Most and Hasselmann, had one plan, that is, to call for violence and terror; Höchberg, Schramm and (partly) Bernstein had another, which they began to preach to the Social-Democrats, somewhat as follows: They themselves provoked the passing of the anti-Socialist laws by being unreasonably bitter and revolutionary, and must now show that they deserve pardon by exemplary conduct. There was yet a third plan proposed by those who paved the way for and carried out the publication of an illegal organ. It is easy, of course, in retrospect, many years after the fight over the selection of the path to be followed has finished, and after history has pronounced its verdict as to the expediency of the path selected, to utter profound maxims about the growth of party tasks that grow with the party. But at a time of confusion,* when the Russian "critics" and Economists degrade Social-Democracy to the level of trade unionism, and when the terrorists are strongly advocating the adoption of a "plan of tactics" that repeats the old mistakes, at such a time, to confine oneself to such profundities, means simply to issue to oneself a "certificate of mental poverty." At a time when many Russian Social-Democrats suffer from lack of initiative and energy, from a lack of "breadth of political propaganda, agitation and organisation,** a lack of plans for a broader organisation of revolutionary work, at such a time to say: "A plan of tactics contradicts the fundamental spirit of Marxism," not only means theoretically to vulgarise Marxism, but also practically *to drag the party backward. Rabocheye Dyelo* goes on sermonising:

> The revolutionary Social-Democrat is only confronted by the task of accelerating objective development by his conscious work; it is not his task to obviate it or substitute his own subjective plans for this development. *Iskra* knows all this in theory. But the enormous importance which Marxism quite justly attaches to conscious revolutionary work causes it in practice, owing to its doctrinaire view of tactics, to *belittle the significance of the objective or the spontaneous elements of development* [p. 18].

Another example of the extraordinary theoretical confusion worthy of V. V. and that fraternity. We would ask our philosopher:

* *Ein Jahr Der Verwirrung* (*A Year of Confusion*) is the title Mehring gave to the chapter of his *History of German Social-Democracy* in which he describes the hesitancy and lack of determination displayed at first by the Socialists in selecting the "plan of tactics" for the new situation.

** See leading article in *Iskra*, No. 1, "The Urgent Tasks of our Movement," p. 53, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

How may a deviser of subjective plans "belittle" objective development? Obviously by losing sight of the fact that this objective development creates or strengthens, destroys or weakens certain classes, strata, groups, nations, groups of nations, etc., and in this way creates a definite international, political grouping of forces, the position of revolutionary parties, etc. If the deviser of plans did that, his mistake would not be that he belittled the spontaneous element, but that he belittled the *conscious element*, for he would then show that he lacked the "consciousness" that would enable him properly to understand objective development. Hence, the very talk about "estimating the *relative* significance" (*Rabocheye Dyelo's* italics) of spontaneity and consciousness sufficiently reveals a complete lack of "consciousness." If certain "spontaneous elements of development" can be grasped at all by human understanding, then an incorrect estimation of them would be tantamount to "belittling the conscious element." But if they cannot be grasped, then we cannot be aware of them, and therefore, cannot speak of them. What is B. Krichevsky arguing about then? If he thinks that *Iskra's* "subjective plans" are erroneous (as he in fact declares them to be), then he ought to show what objective facts are ignored in these plans, and then charge *Iskra* with *a lack of consciousness* for ignoring them, with, to use his own words, "belittling the conscious element." If, however, while being displeased with subjective plans he can bring forward no other argument except that of "belittling the spontaneous element" (!!) he merely shows: 1. That he theoretically understands Marxism à la Kareyevs and the Mikhailovskys, who have been sufficiently ridiculed by Beltov,[199] and 2. That practically, he is quite pleased with the "spontaneous elements of development" that have drawn our legal Marxists towards Bernsteinism and our Social-Democrats towards Economism, and that he is full of wrath against those who have determined at all costs to *divert* Russian Social-Democracy from the path of spontaneous development.

And then follow things that are positively funny. "In the same way as men and women will multiply in the old-fashioned way, notwithstanding all the discoveries of natural science, so the birth of a new social order will come about in the future *mainly* as a result of elemental outbursts, notwithstanding all the discoveries of social science and the increase in the number of conscious fighters." [p. 19.] Our grandfathers, in their old-fashioned wisdom used to

say: "Any fool can bring forth children," and to-day the "modern Socialists" (à la Narcissus Tuporylov) [200] in their wisdom say: Any fool can help the spontaneous birth of a new social order. We too are of that opinion. All that is required for help of that kind is to *surrender* to Economism when Economism reigns and to terrorism when terrorism arises. For example, in the spring of this year, when it was so important to utter a note of warning against terrorism, *Rabocheye Dyelo* stood in amazement confronted by a problem that was "new" to it and now, six months after, when the problem has become less topical, it, at one and the same time, presents us with the declaration: "We think that it is not and cannot be the task of Social-Democracy to counteract the rise of terroristic temper" [*Rabocheye Dyelo,* No. 10, p. 23], and the congress resolution: "The congress regards systematic and aggressive terror as being inopportune" [*Two Congresses,* p. 18]. How beautifully clear and connected this is! Not to counteract, but to declare inopportune, and to declare it in such a way that the "resolution" shall not apply to unsystematic and defencive terror. It must be admitted that a resolution like that is extremely safe and completely insured against error, just as a man who talks, but says nothing, is insured against error! And all that is required to be able to draft a resolution like that is: Ability to keep *at the tail end* of the movement. When *Iskra* ridiculed *Rabocheye Dyelo* for declaring the question of terror to be a new one,* the latter angrily accused *Iskra* of "having the incredible effrontery to impose upon the party organisations decisions on tactical questions arrived at by a group of emigrant writers more than sixteen years ago" [p. 24]. Effrontery indeed, and an exaggeration of the conscious elements to find the theoretical solutions to problems, and then to try to prove to the organisation, to the party and to the masses that this solution is correct! ** How much better it is to repeat something that has been learned by rote, and, without "imposing" anything upon anybody, swing with every "turn" in the direction of Economism or in the direction of terrorism. *Rabocheye Dyelo* even goes so far as to generalise this gospel of worldly wisdom and accuses

* See beginning of article "Where to Begin," p. 109, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

** Nor must it be forgotten that in solving "theoretically" the problem of terror, the Emancipation of Labour group *generalised* the experience of the preceding revolutionary movement.

Iskra and *Zarya* with "setting up its programme against the movement, like a spirit hovering over the formless chaos" (p. 29). But what else is the function of Social-Democracy if not to be a "spirit," not only hovering over the spontaneous movement but also *raising* the movement *to the level of "its programme"?* Surely, it is not its function to drag at the *tail* of the movement: At best, this would be of no service to the movement; at the worst, it would be very, very harmful. *Rabocheye Dyelo,* however, not only follows this "tactics-process," but elevates it to a principle, so that it would be more correct to describe its tendency not as opportunism, but *khvostism* (from the word *khvost*).* And it must be admitted, that those who have determined always to follow behind the movement like a tail, are absolutely and forever ensured against "belittling the spontaneous element of development."

And so, we have become convinced that the fundamental error committed by the "new tendency" in Russian Social-Democracy lies in its subservience to spontaneity, and its failure to understand that the spontaneity of the masses demands a mass of consciousness from us Social-Democrats. The more spontaneously the masses rise, the more widespread the movement becomes, so much the more rapidly grows the demand for greater consciousness in the theoretical, political and organisational work of Social-Democracy.

The spontaneous rise of the masses in Russia proceeded (and continues) with such rapidity that the young untrained Social-Democrats proved unfitted for the gigantic tasks that confronted them. This lack of training is our common misfortune, the misfortune of *all* Russian Social-Democrats. The rise of the masses proceeded and spread uninterruptedly and continuously; it not only continued in the places it commenced in, but it spread to new localities and to new strata of the population (influenced by the labour movement, the ferment among the students and the intellectuals generally, and even among the peasantry revived). Revolutionaries, however, *lagged behind* this rise of the masses in both their "theories" and in their practical activity; they failed to establish an uninterrupted organisation having continuity with the past, and capable of *leading* the whole movement.

In Chapter I, we proved that *Rabocheye Dyelo* degraded our theoretical tasks and that it "spontaneously" repeated the fashion-

* *Khvost* is the Russian word for tail.—*Ed.*

able catch-word "freedom of criticism": that those who repeated this catch-word lacked the "consciousness" to understand that the position of the opportunist "critics" and the revolutionaries, both in Germany and in Russia, are diametrically opposed to each other.

In the following chapters, we shall show how this subservience to spontaneity found expression in the sphere of the political tasks and the organisational work of Social-Democracy.

III

TRADE-UNION POLITICS AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC POLITICS

We shall start off again from the praises that have been sung for *Rabocheye Dyelo*. Martynov gave his article in No. 10 of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, on his differences with *Iskra*, the title: "Exposure Literature and the Proletarian Struggle." He formulated the substance of these differences as follows:

> We cannot confine ourselves entirely to exposing the state of affairs that stand in its [the labour party's] path of development. We must also respond to the immediate and current interests of the proletariat [p. 63].

". . . *Iskra* . . . is in fact the organ of revolutionary opposition that exposes the state of affairs in our country, particularly the political state of affairs. . . . We, however, work and shall continue to work for the cause of labour in close organic contact with the proletarian struggle" [*ibid.*]. One cannot help being grateful to Martynov for this formula. It is of exceptional general interest because substantially it embraces not only our disagreements with *Rabocheye Dyelo*, but the general disagreement between ourselves and the Economists concerning the political struggle. We have shown already that the Economists do not altogether repudiate "politics," but that they are constantly deviating from the Social-Democratic conception of politics to the trade-unionist conception. Martynov deviates in exactly the same way, and we agree, therefore, to take him as an *example* of an Economist wandering into error on this question. As we shall endeavour to prove, neither the authors of the Special Supplement of *Rabochaya Mysl*, nor the authors of the manifesto issued by the Emancipation group, nor the authors of the Economist Letter published in *Iskra*, No. 12, will have any right to complain against this choice.

A. Political Agitation and Its Restriction by the Economists

Every one knows that the spread and consolidation of the economic * struggle of the Russian workers proceeded simultaneously

* In order to avoid misunderstanding we would state, that here, and throughout this pamphlet, by economic struggle, we mean (in accordance with

with the creation of a "literature" exposing economic conditions, *i. e.*, factory and industrial conditions. These "leaflets" were devoted mainly to the exposure of factory conditions, and very soon a passion for exposures was roused among the workers. As soon as the workers realised that the Social-Democratic circles desired to and could supply them with a new kind of leaflet that told the whole truth about their poverty-stricken lives, about their excessive toil and their lack of rights, correspondence began to pour in from the factories and workshops. This "exposure literature" created a sensation not only in the particular factory dealt with and the conditions of which were exposed in a given leaflet, but in all the factories to which news had spread about the facts exposed. And as the poverty and want among the workers in the various enterprises and in the various trades are pretty much the same, the "Truth about the life of the workers" roused the admiration *of all.* Even among the most backward workers, a veritable passion was roused to "go into print"—a noble passion to adopt this rudimentary form of war against the whole of the modern social system which is based upon robbery and oppression. And in the overwhelming majority of cases these "leaflets" were in truth a declaration of war, because the exposures had a terrifically rousing effect upon the workers; it stimulated them to put forward demands for the removal of the most glaring evils, and roused in them a readiness to support these demands with strikes. Finally, the employers themselves were compelled to recognise the significance of these leaflets as a declaration of war, so much so that in a large number of cases they did not even wait for the outbreak of hostilities. As is always the case, the mere publication of these exposures made them effective, and they acquired the significance of a strong moral force. On more than one occasion, the mere appearance of a leaflet proved sufficient to compel an employer to concede all or part of the demands put forward. In a word, economic (factory) exposures have been an important lever in the economic struggle and they will continue to be so as long as capitalism, which creates the need for the workers to defend themselves, exists. Even in the more progressive countries of Europe to-day, the exposure of the evils in some backward

the meaning of the term as it has become accepted amongst us) the "practical economic struggle" which Engels, in the passage we quoted above, described as "resistance to capitalism," and which in free countries is known as the trade-union struggle.

trade, or in some forgotten branch of domestic industry, serves as a starting point for the awakening of class-consciousness, for the beginning of a trade-union struggle, and for the spread of Socialism.*

Recently, the overwhelming majority of Russian Social-Democrats were almost wholly engaged in this work of exposing factory conditions. It is sufficient to refer to the columns of *Rabochaya Mysl* to judge to what an extent they were engaged in it. So much so indeed, that they lost sight of the fact that this, *taken by itself*, was not substantially Social-Democratic work, but merely trade-union work. As a matter of fact, these exposures merely dealt with the relations between the workers *in a given trade*, with their immediate employers, and all that it achieved was that the vendors of labour power learned to sell their "commodity" on better terms, and to fight the purchasers of labour power over a purely commercial deal. These exposures might have served (if properly utilized by revolutionaries) as a beginning and a constituent part of Social-Democratic activity, but they might also (and with subservience to spontaneity inevitably had to) have led to a "pure and simple" trade-union struggle and to a non-Social-Democratic labour movement. Social-Democrats lead the struggle of the working class not only for better terms for the sale of labour power, but also for the abolition of the social system which compels the propertyless class to sell itself to the rich. Social-Democracy represents the working class, not in its relation to a given group of employers, but in its relation to all classes in modern society, to the state as an organised political force. Hence, it not only follows that Social-Democrats must not

* In the present chapter, we deal only with the *political* struggle; *i. e.*, whether it is to be understood in its broader or narrower sense. Therefore, we refer only in passing, merely to point out a curiosity, to the accusation that *Rabocheye Dyelo* hurls against *Iskra* of being "too restrained" in regard to the economic struggle [*Two Congresses*, p. 27, rehashed by Martynov in his pamphlet: *Social-Democracy and the Working Class*]. If those who make this accusation counted up in terms of hundredweights or reams, as they are so fond of doing, what has been said about the economic struggle in the industrial column of *Iskra* in one year's issue, and compared this with the industrial columns of *Rabocheye Dyelo* and *Rabochaya Mysl* taken together, they would see that they lag very much behind even in this respect. Apparently, the consciousness of this simple truth compels them to resort to arguments which clearly reveal their confusion. "*Iskra*," they write, "willy-nilly [!] is compelled [!] to take note of the imperative demands of life and to publish at least [!!!] correspondence about the labour movement" [*Two Congresses*, p. 27]. Now this is really a crushing argument!

confine themselves entirely to the economic struggle; they must not even allow the organisation of economic exposures to become the predominant part of their activities. We must actively take up the political education of the working class, and the development of its political consciousness. *Now*, after *Zarya* and *Iskra* have made the first attack upon Economism "all are agreed" with this (although some agree only nominally, as we shall soon prove).

The question now arises: What does political education mean? Is it sufficient to confine oneself to the propaganda of working-class hostility to autocracy? Of course not. It is not enough to *explain* to the workers that they are politically oppressed (any more than it was to *explain* to them that their interests were antagonistic to the interests of the employers). Advantage must be taken of every concrete example of this oppression for the purpose of agitation (in the same way as we began to use concrete examples of economic oppression for the purpose of agitation). And inasmuch as *political* oppression affects all sorts of classes in society, inasmuch as it manifests itself in various spheres of life and activity, in industrial life, civic life, in personal and family life, in religious life, scientific life, etc., etc., is it not evident that *we shall not be fulfilling our task* of developing the political consciousness of the workers if *we do not undertake* the organisation of the *political exposure of autocracy in all its aspects?* In order to agitate over concrete examples of oppression, these examples must be exposed (in the same way as it was necessary to expose factory evils in order to carry on economic agitation).

One would think that this was clear enough. It turns out, however, that "all" are agreed that it is necessary to develop political consciousness *in all its aspects*, only in words. It turns out that *Rabocheye Dyelo,* for example, has not only failed to take up the task of organising (or to make a start in organising) in all-sided political exposure, but is even trying to *drag Iskra*, which has undertaken this task, *away from it.* Listen to this: "The political struggle of the working class is merely [it is precisely not "merely"] a more developed, a wider and more effective form of economic struggle." [Programme of *Rabocheye Dyelo* published in No. 1, p. 3.] "The Social-Democrats are now confronted with the task of, as far as possible, giving the economic struggle itself a political character" [Martynov, *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, p. 42]. "The economic struggle is the most widely applicable method of drawing the masses into

active political struggle" (resolution passed by the congress of the League and "amendments" thereto). [*Two Congresses*, pp. 11 and 17]. As the reader will observe, all these postulates permeate *Rabocheye Dyelo*, from its very first number to the recently issued Instructions by the Editorial Committee, and all of them evidently express a single view regarding political agitation and the political struggle. Examine this view from the standpoint of the opinion prevailing among all Economists, that political agitation must *follow* economic agitation. Is it true that, in general,* the economic struggle "is the most widely applicable method" of drawing the masses into the political struggle? It is absolutely untrue. All and sundry manifestations of police tyranny and autocratic outrage, in addition to the evils connected with the economic struggle, are equally "widely applicable" as a means of "drawing in" the masses. The tyranny of the Zemstvo chiefs, the flogging of the peasantry, the corruption of the officials, the conduct of the police towards the "common people" in the cities, the fight against the famine-stricken and the suppression of the popular striving towards enlightenment and knowledge, the extortion of taxes, the persecution of the religious sects, the severe discipline in the army, the militarist conduct towards the students and the liberal intelligentsia—all these and a thousand other similar manifestations of tyranny, though not directly connected with the "economic" struggle, do they, in general, represent a *less* "widely applicable" method and subject for political agitation and for drawing the masses into the political struggle? The very opposite is the case. Of all the innumerable cases in which the workers suffer (either personally or those closely associated with them) from tyranny, violence, and lack of rights, undoubtedly only a relatively few represent cases of police tyranny in the economic struggle as such. Why then should we beforehand *restrict* the scope of political agitation by declaring *only one* of the

* We say "in general," advisedly, because *Rabocheye Dyelo* speaks of general principles and of the general tasks of the whole party. Undoubtedly, cases occur in practice, when politics *must* follow economics, but only Economists can say a thing like that in a resolution that was intended to apply to the whole of Russia. Cases do occur when it is possible "right from the beginning," to carry on political agitation "exclusively on an economic basis"; and yet *Rabocheye Dyelo* went so far as to say that "there was no need for this whatever" [*Two Congresses*, p. 11]. In the next chapter, we shall show that the tactics of the "politicians" and revolutionaries not only do not ignore the trade-union tasks of Social-Democracy, but that, on the contrary, they alone *can secure* the consistent fulfilment of these tasks.

methods to be "the most widely applicable," when Social-Democrats have other, generally speaking, not less "widely applicable" means?

Long, long ago (a year ago! . . .) *Rabocheye Dyelo* wrote:

> The masses begin to understand immediate political demands after one, or at all events, after several strikes; immediately the government sets the police and gendarmerie against them [No. 7, p. 15, August, 1900].[201]

This opportunist theory of stages has now been rejected by the League, which makes a concession to us by declaring: "There is no need whatever to conduct political agitation right from the beginning, exclusively on an economic basis." [*Two Congresses*, p. 11.] This very repudiation of part of its former errors by the League will enable the future historian of Russian Social-Democracy to discern the depths to which our Economists have degraded Socialism better than any number of lengthy arguments! But the League must be very naïve indeed to imagine that the abandonment of one form of restricting politics will induce us to agree to another form of restriction! Would it not be more logical to say that the ecoonmic struggle should be conducted on the widest possible basis, that it should be utilised for political agitation, but that "there is no need whatever" to regard the economic struggle as the *most* widely applicable means of drawing the masses into active political struggle?

The League attaches significance to the fact that it substituted the phrase "most widely applicable method" by the phrase "a better method," contained in one of the resolutions of the Fourth Congress of the Jewish Labour League (Bund).[202] We confess that we find it difficult to say which of these resolutions is the better one. In our opinion *both are bad.* Both the League and the Bund fall into error (partly perhaps unconsciously, owing to the influence of tradition) concerning the economic, trade-unionist interpretation of politics. The fact that this error is expressed either by the word "better" or by the words "most widely applicable" makes no material difference whatever. If the League had said that "political agitation on an economic basis" is the most widely applied (and not "applicable") method it would have been right in regard to a certain period in the development of our Social-Democratic movement. It would have been right in regard to the *Economists and to many* (if not the majority) of the practical Economists of 1898-1901 who have *applied* the method of political agitation (to the extent that they applied it at all) *almost exclusively on an economic basis.* Political agitation on *such* lines was recognised, and as we have seen,

even recommended by *Rabochaya Mysl,* and by the Self-Emancipation group! *Rabocheye Dyelo* should have *strongly condemned* the fact that useful economic agitation was accompanied by the harmful restriction of the political struggle, but instead of that, it declares the method most widely *applied* (*by the Economists*) to be the most widely *applicable!* It is not surprising, therefore, that when we describe these people as Economists, they can do nothing else but pour abuse upon us, and call us "mystifiers," "disrupters," "Papal Nuncios," and "slanderers," * go complaining to the world that we have mortally offended them and declare almost on oath that "not a single Social-Democratic organisation is now tinged with Economism.** Oh, these evil, slanderous politicians! They must have deliberately invented this Economism, out of sheer hatred of mankind, in order mortally to offend other people!

What do the words "to give the economic struggle itself a political character," which Martynov uses in presenting the tasks of Social-Democracy, mean concretely? The economic struggle is the collective struggle of the workers against their employers for better terms *in the sale of their labour power,* for better conditions of life and labour. This struggle is necessarily a struggle according to trade, because conditions of labour differ very much in different trades, and, consequently, the fight to *improve* these conditions can only be conducted in respect of each trade (trade unions in the Western countries, temporary trade associations and leaflets in Russia, etc.). To give "the economic struggle itself a political character" means, therefore, to strive to secure satisfaction for these trade demands, the improvement of conditions of labour in each separate trade by means of "legislative and administrative measures" (as Martynov expresses it on the next page of his article, p. 43). This is exactly what the trade unions do and always have done. Read the works of the thoroughly scientific (and "thoroughly" opportunist) Mr. and Mrs. Webb [203] and you will find that the British trade unions long ago recognised, and have long carried out the task of "giving the economic struggle itself a political character"; they have long been fighting for the right to strike, for the removal of all juridical hindrances to the co-operative and trade-union movement, for laws protecting women and children, for the im-

* These are exactly the expressions used in *Two Congresses,* pp. 28, 30, 31, and 32.

** *Two Congresses,* p. 32.

provement of conditions of labour by means of sanitary and factory legislation, etc.

Thus, the pompous phrase: "To give the economic struggle *itself* a political character," which sounds so "terrifically" profound and revolutionary, serves as a screen to conceal what is in fact the traditional striving to *degrade* Social-Democratic politics to the level of trade-union politics! On the pretext of rectifying *Iskra's* one-sidedness, which, it is alleged, places "the revolutionising of dogma higher than the revolutionising of life," * we are presented with the *struggle for economic reforms* as if it were something entirely new. As a matter of fact, the phrase "to give the economic struggle itself a political character" means nothing more than the struggle for economic reforms. And Martynov himself might have come to this simple conclusion had he only pondered over the significance of his own words. "Our party," he says, turning his heaviest guns against *Iskra*, "could and should have presented concrete demands to the government for legislative and administrative measures against economic exploitation, for the relief of unemployment, for the relief of the famine-stricken, etc." [*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, pp. 42, 43.] Concrete demands for measures—does not this mean demands for social reforms? And again we ask the impartial reader, do we slander the *Rabocheye Dyeloists* (may I be forgiven for this clumsy expression!) when we declare them to be concealed Bernsteinists, for advancing their thesis about the necessity for fighting for economic reforms as a reason for their *disagreement* with *Iskra?*

Revolutionary Social-Democracy always included, and now includes, the fight for reforms in its activities. But it utilises "economic" agitation for the purpose of presenting to the government, not only demands for all sorts of measures, but also (and primarily) the demand that it cease to be an autocratic government. Moreover, it considers it to be its duty to present this demand to the government, not on the basis of the economic struggle *alone*, but on the basis of all manifestations of public and political life. In a word, it subordinates the struggle for reforms to the revolutionary struggle for liberty and for Socialism, in the same way as the part

* *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, p. 60. This is the Martynov variation of the application to the present chaotic state of our movement of the thesis: "A step forward of the real movement is more important than a dozen programmes," to which we have already referred above. As a matter of fact, this is merely a translation into Russian of the notorious Bernsteinist phrase: "The movement is everything, the ultimate aim is nothing."

is subordinate to the whole. Martynov, however, resuscitates the theory of stages in a new form, and strives to prescribe an exclusively economic, so to speak, path of development for the political struggle. By coming out at this moment, when the revolutionary movement is on the up-grade, with an alleged special "task" of fighting for reforms, he is dragging the party backwards, and is playing into the hands of both "economic" and liberal opportunism.

Shamefacedly hiding the struggle for reforms behind the pompous thesis "to give the economic struggle itself a political character," Martynov advanced, as if it were a special point, *exclusively economic* (in fact, exclusively factory) *reforms*. Why he did that, we do not know. Perhaps it was due to carelessness? But if he indeed had only "factory" reforms in mind, then the whole of his thesis, which we have just quoted, loses all sense. Perhaps he did it because he thought it possible and probable that the government would agree to make "concessions" only in the economic sphere? * If that is what he thought, then it is a strange error. Concessions are also possible, and are made in the sphere of legislation concerning flogging, passports, land-compensation payments, religious sects, the censorship, etc., etc. "Economic" concessions (or pseudo-concessions) are, of course, the cheapest and most advantageous concessions to make from the government's point-of-view, because by these means it hopes to win the confidence of the masses of the workers. Precisely for this very reason, Social-Democrats *must under no circumstances* create grounds for the belief (or the misunderstanding) that we attach greater value to economic reforms than to political reforms, or that we regard them as being particularly important, etc. "Such demands," writes Martynov, concerning the concrete demands for legislative and administrative measures referred to above, "would not be merely a hollow sound because, promising certain palpable results, they might be actively supported by the masses of the workers. . . ." We are not Economists, oh, no! We only cringe as slavishly before the "palpableness" of concrete results as do the Bernsteins, the Prokopoviches, the Struves, the R. M.'s, and *tutti quanti!* We only wish to make it understood (with Narcissus Tuporylov) that all that which "does not promise palpable results" is merely a "hollow sound." We are only trying to argue as if the

* P. 43. "Of course, when we advise the workers to present certain economic demands to the government, we do so because in the *economic* sphere, the autocratic government is compelled to agree to make certain concessions."

masses of the workers are incapable (and, of course, have not proved their capabilities, notwithstanding those who ascribe their own philistinism to them) of actively supporting *every* protest against the autocracy even if *it promises absolutely no palpable results whatever!*

Take for example the very "measures" for the relief of unemployment and the famine that Martynov himself advances. While *Rabocheye Dyelo* was engaged, judging by what it has promised, in drawing up a programme of "concrete [in the form of Acts of Legislation?] demands for legislative and administrative measures," "promising palpable results," *Iskra*, which "constantly places the revolutionising of dogma higher than the revolutionising of life," tried to explain the inseparable connection that exists between unemployment and the capitalist system as a whole; uttered the warning that "famine is coming"; exposed the police "fight against the famine-stricken" and the outrageous "provisional penal regulations"; and *Zarya* published a special edition in the form of an agitation pamphlet, entitled, *Review of Internal Affairs*, a part of its text which was devoted to the famine. But good God! How "one-sided" these incorrigibly narrow and orthodox doctrinaires were in this; how deaf to the calls of "life itself"! Not one of these articles contained—oh horror!—a single, can you imagine it?—*a single* "concrete demand," "promising palpable results"! Poor doctrinaires! They sought to be sent to Krichevky and Martynov to be taught that tactics are a process of growth, etc., and that the economic struggle *itself* should be given a political character!

> In addition to its immediately revolutionary significance, the workers' economic struggle against the employers and the government ["*economic* struggle against the government"!!] has also this significance that it constantly brings the workers face to face with their own lack of political rights [Martynov, p. 44].

We quote this passage not in order to repeat what has been said already a hundred and a thousand times before, but in order to thank Martynov for this excellent new formula: "The workers' economic struggle against the employers and the government." What a pearl! With what inimitable talent and skill in eliminating partial disagreements and shades of differences among Economists, does this clear and concise postulate express the *quintessence* of Economism: From calling to the workers to join "in the political struggle which they carry on in the general interest, for the purpose

of improving the conditions of all the workers," * continuing through the theory of stages, to the resolution of the congress on the "most widely applicable," etc., "economic struggle against the government" is precisely trade-union politics, which is far, far away from being Social-Democratic politics.

B. A Tale of How Martynov Rendered Plekhanov More Profound

"What a large number of Social-Democratic Lomonosovs ** appeared among us lately!" observed a comrade to me one day, having in mind the astonishing propensity of many of those who are inclined toward Economism to "seek for themselves" the great truths (for example, like the one that the economic struggle stimulates the workers to ponder over their lack of rights), and in doing so ignore, with the supreme contempt of born geniuses, all that which has already been produced by previous development of revolutionary thought and of the revolutionary movement. Precisely such a born genius is Lomonosov-Martynov. Glance at his article, "Immediate Questions," and observe how he "in his way" *approaches* that which has been said long ago by Axelrod (and whom our Lomonosov silently ignores); how, for example, he is *beginning* to understand that we must not ignore the opposition of the various strata of the bourgeoisie [*Rabocheye Dyelo* No. 9, pp. 61-62-71; compare this with *Rabocheye Dyelo's Reply* to Axelrod, pp. 22-23-24], etc. But alas, he is only "approaching" and is only "beginning," not more than that, for so little has he understood Axelrod's ideas, that he talks about "the economic struggle against the employers and the government." For three years (1898-1901) *Rabocheye Dyelo* has tried hard to understand Axelrod, but has failed to do so yet! Perhaps this is because Social-Democracy, "like humanity," always sets itself only tasks that can be achieved.

But the Lomonosovs are distinguished not only by the fact of their ignorance of many things (that would not be so bad!) but also by the fact that they are not conscious of their ignorance. Now this is a real misfortune, and this misfortune stimulates them to attempt to render Plekhanov "more profound."

* *Rabochaya Mysl*, Special Supplement, p. 14.

** Kholmogory Lomonosov (1711-1765) the inventive genius and the recognised father of Russian science.—*Ed.*

Lomonosov-Martynov writes:

> Much water has flowed beneath the bridges since Plekhanov wrote this book. [*Socialist Tasks in the Fight against the Famine in Russia*]. The Social-Democrats who for a decade led the economic struggle of the working class . . . have failed as yet to lay down a broad theoretical basis for party tactics. This question has now come to the fore, and if we would wish to lay down such a theoretical basis we would certainly have to considerably deepen the principles of tactics that Plekhanov at one time developed. . . . We would now have to define the difference between propaganda and agitation differently from the way in which Plekhanov defined it. [Martynov had just previously quoted the words of Plekhanov: "A propagandist presents many ideas to one or a few persons; an agitator presents only one or a few ideas, but he presents them to a mass of people."] By propaganda we would understand the revolutionary elucidation of the whole of the present system or partial manifestations of it, irrespective of whether it is done in a form capable of being understood by individuals or by the broad masses. By agitation, in the strict sense of the word [*sic!*] we would understand: Calling the masses to certain concrete actions that would facilitate the direct revolutionary intervention of the proletariat in social life.

We congratulate Russian, and international Social-Democracy on Martynov's more strict and more profound terminology. Up till now we thought (with Plekhanov, and with all the leaders of the international labour movement), that a propagandist, dealing with say the question of unemployment, must explain the capitalistic nature of crises, the reasons why crises are inevitable in modern society, must describe how present society must inevitably become transformed into Socialist society, etc. In a word, he must present "many ideas," so many indeed that they will be understood as a whole only by a (comparatively) few persons. An agitator, however, speaking on the same subject will take as an illustration a fact that is most widely known and outstanding among his audience —say the death from starvation of the family of an unemployed worker, the growing impoverishment, etc.—and utilising this illustration, will direct all his efforts to present *a single idea* to the "masses," *i. e.*, the idea of the senseless contradiction between the increase of wealth and increase of poverty; he will strive to *rouse* discontent and indignation among the masses against this crying injustice, and leave a more complete explanation of this contradiction to the propagandist. Consequently, the propagandist operates chiefly by means of the *printed* word; the agitator operates with the *living* word. The qualities that are required of an agitator are not the same as the qualities that are required of a propagandist. Kautsky and Lafargue, for example, we call propagandists; Bebel

and Guesde we call agitators. To point to a third sphere, or third function, of practical activity, and to include in this third function "calling the masses to certain concrete actions," is sheer nonsense, because the "call," as a single act, either naturally and inevitably supplements the theoretical tract, propagandist pamphlet and agitational speech, or represents a purely executive function. Take, for example, the struggle now being carried on by the German Social-Democrats against the grain duties. The theoreticians write researches in tariff policy and "call" say, for a fight for commercial treaties and for free trade. The propagandist does the same thing in the periodical press, and the agitator does it in public speeches. At the present time, the "concrete action" of the masses takes the form of signing petitions to the Reichstag against the raising of the grain duties. The call for this action comes directly from the theoreticians, the propagandists and the agitators, and indirectly, from those workers who carry the petition lists to the factories and to private houses to get signatures. According to the "Martynov terminology," Kautsky and Bebel are both propagandists, while those who carry the petition lists around are agitators; is that not so?

The German example recalled to my mind the German word *Verballhornung*, which literally translated means "to Ballhorn." Johann Ballhorn, a Leipzig publisher of the sixteenth century, published a child's reader in which, as was the custom, he introduced a drawing of a cock; but this drawing, instead of portraying an ordinary cock with spurs, portrayed it without spurs and with a couple of eggs lying near it. On the cover of this reader he printed the legend "*Revised* edition by Johann Ballhorn." Since that time the Germans describe any "Revision" that is really a worsening, as "Ballhorning." And watching Martynov's attempts to render Plekhanov "more profound" involuntarily recalls Ballhorn to one's mind. . . .

Why did our Lomonosov "invent" this confusion? In order to illustrate how *Iskra* "devotes attention only to one side of the case, just as Plekhanov did a decade and a half ago" [p. 39]. "According to *Iskra*, propagandist tasks force agitational tasks into the background, at least for the present" [p. 52]. If we translate this last postulate from the language of Martynov into ordinary human language (because humanity has not yet managed to learn the newly invented terminology), we shall get the following: "According to *Iskra*, the tasks of political propaganda and political agitation force

into the background the task of 'presenting to the government concrete demands for legislative and administrative measures' that promise certain palpable results" (or demands for social reforms, that is if we are permitted just once again to employ the old terminology of old humanity, which has not yet grown to Martynov's level). We suggest that the reader compare this thesis with the following tirade:

> What astonishes us in these programmes [the programmes advanced by revolutionary Social-Democrats], is the constant stress that is laid upon the benefits of labour activity in parliament (non-existent in Russia) and the manner in which (thanks to their revolutionary Nihilism) the importance of workers participating in the Government Advisory Committees on Factory Affairs (which do exist in Russia) . . . or at least the importance of workers participating in municipal bodies, is completely ignored. . . .

The author of this tirade expresses more straightforwardly, more clearly and frankly, the very idea which, although Lomonosov-Martynov discovered it himself, actually originated in the mind of R. M. in the Special Supplement of *Rabochaya Mysl* [p. 15].

C. Political Exposures and "Training in Revolutionary Activity"

In advancing against *Iskra* his "theory" of "raising the activity of the masses of the workers," Martynov, as a matter of fact, displayed a striving to *diminish* this activity, because he declared the very economic struggle before which all Economists grovel to be the preferable, the most important and "the most widely applicable means of rousing this activity, and the widest field for it." This error is such a characteristic one, precisely because it is not peculiar to Martynov alone. As a matter of fact, it is possible to "raise the activity of the masses of the workers" *only* provided this activity *is not restricted entirely* to "political agitation on an economic basis." And one of the fundamental conditions for the necessary expansion of political agitation is the organisation of *all-sided* political exposure. In *no other way* can the masses be trained in political consciousness and revolutionary activity except by means of such exposures. Hence, to conduct such activity is one of the most important functions of international Social-Democracy as a whole, for even in countries where political liberty exists, there is still a field for work of exposure, although in such countries the work

is conducted in a different sphere. For example, the German party is strengthening its position and spreading its influence, thanks particularly to the untiring energy with which it is conducting a campaign of political exposure. Working-class consciousness cannot be genuinely political consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to all cases of tyranny, oppression, violence and abuse, no matter *what class* is affected. Moreover, that response must be a Social-Democratic response, and not one from any other point-of-view. The consciousness of the masses of the workers cannot be genuine class consciousness, unless the workers learn to observe from concrete, and above all from topical, political facts and events, *every* other social class and *all* the manifestations of the intellectual, ethical and political life of these classes; unless they learn to apply practically the materialist analysis and the materialist estimate of *all* aspects of the life and activity of *all* classes, strata and groups of the population. Those who concentrate the attention, observation and the consciousness of the working class exclusively, or even mainly, upon itself alone, are not Social-Democrats; because, for its self-realisation the working class must not only have a theoretical . . . rather it would be more true to say: Not so much theoretical as a practical understanding acquired through experience of political life of the relationships between *all* classes of modern society. That is why the idea preached by our Economists, that the economic struggle is the most widely applicable means of drawing the masses into the political movement is so extremely harmful and extremely reactionary in practice. In order to become a Social-Democrat, a working man must have a clear picture in his mind of the economic nature and the social and political features of the landlord, of the priest, of the high state official and of the peasant, of the student and of the tramp; he must know their strong and weak sides; he must understand all the catchwords and sophisms by which each class and each stratum *camouflages* its egotistical strivings and its real "nature"; he must understand what interests certain institutions and certain laws reflect and how they are reflected. The working man cannot obtain this "clear picture" from books. He can obtain it only from living examples and from exposures, following hot after their occurrence, of what goes on around us at a given moment, of what is being discussed, in whispers perhaps, by each one in his own way, of the meaning of such and such events, of such and such statistics, in such and such

court sentences, etc., etc., etc. These universal political exposures are an essential and *fundamental* condition for training the masses in revolutionary activity.

Why is it that the Russian workers as yet display so little revolutionary activity in connection with the brutal way in which the police maltreat the people, in connection with the persecution of the religious sects, with the flogging of the peasantry, with the outrageous censorship, with the torture of soldiers, with the persecution of the most innocent cultural enterprises, etc.? Is it because the "economic struggle" does not "stimulate" them to this, because such political activity does not "promise palpable results," because it produces little that is "positive"? To advance this argument, we repeat, is merely to shift the blame to the shoulders of others, to blame the masses of the workers for our own philistinism (also Bernsteinism). We must blame ourselves, our remoteness from the mass movement; we must blame ourselves for being unable as yet to organise a sufficiently wide, striking and rapid exposure of these despicable outrages. When we do that (and we must and can do it), the most backward worker will understand, *or will feel,* that the students and religious sects, the muzhiks and the authors are being abused and outraged by the very same dark forces that are oppressing and crushing him at every step of his life, and, feeling that, he himself will be filled with an irresistible desire to respond to these things and then he will organise cat-calls against the censors one day, another day he will demonstrate outside the house of the provincial governor who has brutally suppressed peasant uprisings, another day he will teach a lesson to the gendarmes in surplices who are doing the work of the Holy Inquisition, etc. As yet we have done very little, almost nothing, to *hurl* universal and fresh exposures among the masses of the workers. Many of us as yet do not appreciate the *bounden duty* that rests upon us, but spontaneously follow in the wake of the "drab every-day struggle," in the narrow confines of factory life. Under such circumstances to say that *Iskra* displays a tendency to belittle the significance of the forward march of the drab every-day struggle in comparison with the propaganda of brilliant and complete ideas [Martynov, p. 61]—means to drag the party backwards, to defend and glorify our unpreparedness and backwardness.

As for calling the masses to action, that will come of itself immediately that energetic political agitation, live and striking ex-

posures are set going. To catch some criminal red-handed and immediately to brand him publicly will have far more effect than any number of "appeals to action"; the effect very often will be such, that it will be impossible to tell who exactly it was that "appealed" to the crowd, and who exactly suggested this or that plan of demonstration, etc. Calls for action, not in the general, but in the concrete, sense of the term, can be made only at the place of action; only those who themselves go into action now can make appeals for action. And our business as Social-Democratic publicists is to deepen, expand and intensify political exposures and political agitation. A word in passing about "calls to action." *The only paper* that *prior to* the spring events, *called upon* the workers actively to intervene in a matter that certainly did *not promise* any *palpable results* for the workers, *i. e.*, the drafting of the students into the army, *was Iskra.* Immediately after the publication of the order of January 11 "Drafting the 183 Students into the Army," *Iskra* published an article about it (in its February issue, No. 2),* and *before* any demonstration was started openly *called upon* "the workers to go to the aid of the students," called upon the "people" boldly to take up the government's open challenge. We ask: How is the remarkable fact to be explained that although he talks so much about "calling for action," and even suggests "calling for action" as a special form of activity, Martynov said not a word about *this* call? After this, is not Martynov's allegation, that *Iskra* was *one-sided* because it did not sufficiently "call for" the struggle for demands "promising palpable results," sheer philistinism?

Our Economists, including *Rabocheye Dyelo* were successful because they disguised themselves as uneducated workers. But the working-class Social-Democrat, the working-class revolutionist (and their number is growing) will indignantly reject all this talk about fighting for demands "promising palpable results," etc., because he will understand that this is only a variation of the old song about adding a kopeck to the ruble. These working-class revolutionaries will say to their counsellors of the *Rabochaya Mysl* and *Rabocheye Dyelo:* You are wasting your time, gentlemen; you are interfering with excessive zeal in a job that we can manage ourselves, and you are neglecting your own duties. It is silly of you to say that the Social-Democrats's task is to give the economic struggle itself a political character, for that is only the beginning, it is not the

* See p. 70, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

main task that Social-Democrats must fulfil. All over the world, including Russia, *the police themselves often give* the economic struggle a political character, and the workers are beginning to understand whom the government supports.*

The "economic struggle between the workers and the employers and the government," about which you make as much fuss as if you had made a new discovery, is being carried on in all parts of Russia, even the most remote, by the workers themselves who have heard about strikes, but who have heard almost nothing about Socialism. The "activity" you want to stimulate among us workers by advancing concrete demands promising palpable results, we are already displaying and in our every-day, petty trade-union work, we put forward concrete demands, very often without any assistance from the intellectuals whatever. But *such* activity is not enough for us; we are not children to be fed on the sops of "economic" politics alone; we want to know everything that everybody else knows, we want to learn the details of *all* aspects of political life and to take part *actively* in every political event. In order that we may do this, the intellectuals must talk to us less on what we already know,** and tell us more about what we do not know and what we

* The demand "to give the economic struggle itself a political character" most strikingly expresses *subservience to spontaneity* in the sphere of political activity. Very often the economic struggle *spontaneously* assumes a political character, that is to say without the injection of the "revolutionary bacilli of the intelligentsia," without the intervention of the class-conscious Social-Democrats. For example, the economic struggle of the British workers assumed a political character without the intervention of the Socialists. The tasks of the Social-Democrats, however, are not exhausted by political agitation on the economic field; their task is to *convert* trade-union politics into the Social-Democratic political struggle, to *utilise* the flashes of political consciousness which gleam in the minds of the workers during their economic struggles for the purpose of *raising* them to the level of *Social-Democratic* political consciousness. The Martynovs, however, instead of raising and stimulating the spontaneously awakening political consciousness of the workers, *bow down before spontaneity* and repeat over and over again, until one is sick and tired of hearing it, that the economic struggle "stimulates" in the workers' minds thoughts about their own lack of political rights. It is unfortunate, gentlemen, that the spontaneously awakening trade-union political consciousness does not "*stimulate*" in your minds thoughts about your Social-Democratic tasks!

** To prove that this imaginary speech of a worker to an Economist is based on fact, we shall call two witnesses who undoubtedly have direct knowledge of the labour movement, and who can be least suspected of being partial towards us "doctrinaires," for one witness is an Economist (who regards even *Rabocheye Dyelo* as a political organ!), and the other is a terrorist. The first witness is the author of a remarkably truthful and lively article

can never learn from our factory and "economic" experience, that is, you must give us political knowledge. You intellectuals can acquire this knowledge, and it is your *duty* to bring us that knowledge in a hundred and a thousand times greater measure than you have done up till now; and you must bring us this knowledge, not only in the form of arguments, pamphlets and articles which sometimes—excuse my frankness!—are very dull, but in the form of live *exposures* of what our government and our governing classes are doing at this very moment in all spheres of life. Fulfil this duty with greater zeal, and *talk less about "increasing the activity of the masses of the workers"!* We are far more active than you think, and we are quite able to support by open street fighting demands that do not even promise any "palpable results" whatever! You cannot "increase" our activity, because *you yourselves are not sufficiently active.* Be less subservient to spontaneity, and think more about increasing *your own* activity, gentlemen!

D. What is There in Common Between Economism and Terrorism?

In the last footnote we quoted the opinion of an Economist and of a non-Social-Democratic terrorist who, by chance, proved to be in agreement with him. Speaking generally, however, between the two there is not an accidental, but a necessary mutual connection, about which we shall have to speak farther on in connection with the

entitled "The St. Petersburg Labour Movement and the Practical Tasks of Social-Democracy," published in *Rabocheye Dyelo,* No. 6.[204] He divided the workers into the following categories: 1. Conscious revolutionaries; 2. Intermediate stratum; and 3. The Masses. Now the intermediate stratum he says "is often more interested in questions of political life than in its own immediate economic interests, the connection between which and the general social conditions it has long understood. . . ." *Rabochaya Mysl* "is sharply criticised. It keeps on repeating the same thing over and over again, things we have long known, read long ago." "Nothing in the political review again!" [pp. 30-31]. But even the third stratum—the younger and more sensitive section of the workers, less corrupted by the vodka shop and the church, that has hardly ever had the opportunity of reading political literature, in a rumbling way discuss political events and ponder deeply over the fragmentary news they get about the student riots, etc. The second witness, the terrorist, writes as follows: ". . . They read over once or twice the petty details of factory life in other towns, not their own, and then they read no more. . . . 'Awfully dull,' they say. . . . To say nothing in a workers' paper about the government . . . signifies that the workers are regarded as being little children. . . . The workers are not babies." [*Svoboda,* published by the Revolutionary Socialist group, pp. 67-70.] [205]

question of training the masses in revolutionary activity. The Economists and the modern terrorists spring from a common root, namely, *subservience to spontaneity*, which we dealt with in a previous chapter as a general phenomenon, and which we shall now examine in relation to its effect upon political activity and the political struggle. At first sight, our assertion may appear paradoxical, for the difference between these two appears to be so enormous: One stresses the "drab every-day struggle" and the other calls for the most self-sacrificing struggle of individuals. But this is not a paradox. The Economists and terrorists merely bow to different poles of spontaneity: The Economists bow to the spontaneity of the "pure and simple" labour movement while the terrorists bow to the spontaneity of the passionate indignation of the intellectuals, who are either incapable of linking up the revolutionary struggle with the labour movement, or lack the opportunity to do so. It is very difficult indeed for those who have lost their belief, or who have never believed, that this was possible, to find some other outlet for their indignation and revolutionary energy than terror. Thus, both the forms of subservience to spontaneity we have mentioned are nothing more nor less than *a beginning in the carrying out* of the notorious *Credo* programme. Let the workers carry on their "economic struggle against the employers and the government" (we apologise to the author of *Credo* for expressing his views in Martynov's words! But we think we have the right to do so because even the *Credo* says that in the economic struggle the workers "come up against the political régime"), and let the intellectuals conduct the political struggle by their own efforts—with the aid of terror, of course! This is an absolutely logical and inevitable *conclusion* which must be insisted upon—even though those who are beginning to carry out this programme did not themselves realise that it is inevitable. Political activity has its logic quite apart from the consciousness of those who, with the best intentions, call either for terror, or for giving the economic struggle itself a political character. The road to hell is paved with good intentions, and, in this case, good intentions cannot save one from being spontaneously drawn "along the line of least resistance," along the line of the *purely bourgeois Credo* programme. Surely it is not an accident that many Russian liberals—avowed liberals and liberals who wear the mask of Marxism—wholeheartedly sympathise with

terror, and strive to foster the spirit of terrorism that is running so high at the present time.

The formation of the *Svoboda* Revolutionary Socialist group—which was formed with the object of giving all possible assistance to the labour movement, but which included in its *programme* terror, and emancipation, so to speak, from Social-Democracy—this fact once again confirmed the remarkable penetration of P. B. Axelrod who *literally foretold* these results of Social-Democratic wavering *as far back as* the end of 1897 [*Modern Tasks and Modern Tactics*], when he outlined his remarkable "two prospects." All the subsequent disputes and disagreements among Russian Social-Democrats are contained, like a plant in the seed, in these two prospects.*

From this point of view it will be clear that *Rabocheye Dyelo*, being unable to withstand the spontaneity of Economism, has been unable also to withstand the spontaneity of terrorism. It would be interesting to note here the specific arguments that *Svoboda* advanced in defence of terrorism. It "completely denies" the deterrent rôle of terrorism [*The Regeneration of Revolutionism*, p. 64], but instead stresses its "excitative significance." This is characteristic, firstly, as representing one of the stages of the break-up and decay of the traditional (pre-Social-Democratic) cycle of ideas which insisted upon terrorism. To admit now that the government cannot be "terrified," and therefore disrupted, by terror, is tantamount to condemning terror as a system of struggle, as a sphere of activity sanctioned by the programme. Secondly, it is still more characteristic as an example of the failure to understand our immediate task of "training the masses in revolutionary activity." *Svoboda* advocates terror as a

* Martynov "conceives of another, more realistic [?] dilemma" [*Social-Democracy and the Working Class*, p. 19]: "Either Social-Democracy undertakes the direct leadship of the economic struggle of the proletariat and by that [!] transforms it into a revolutionary class struggle . . ." "and by that," *i. e.*, apparently the direct leadership of the economic struggle. Can Martynov quote an example where the leadership of the industrial struggle *alone* has succeeded in transforming the trade-union movement into a revolutionary class movement? Cannot he understand that in order to "transform" we must undertake the "direct leadership" *of all-sided* political agitation? ". . . Or the other prospect: Social-Democracy refrains from taking the leadership of the economic struggle of the workers and so . . . clips its own wings. . . " In *Rabocheye Dyelo's* opinion, which we quoted above, Iskra "refrains." We have seen, however, that the latter *does far more* to lead the economic struggle than *Rabocheye Dyelo*, but it does not confine itself to this, and does not *curtail* its political tasks for the sake of it.

means of "exciting" the labour movement, and of giving it a "strong impetus." It is difficult to imagine an argument that disproves itself more than this one does! Are there not enough outrages committed in Russian life that a special "stimulant" has to be invented? On the other hand, is it not obvious that those who are not, and cannot be, roused to excitement even by Russian tyranny will stand by "twiddling their thumbs" even while a handful of terrorists are engaged in single combat with the government? The fact is, however, that the masses of the workers are roused to a high pitch of excitement by the outrages committed in Russian life, but we are unable to collect, if one may put it that way, and concentrate all these drops and streamlets of popular excitement that are called forth by the conditions of Russian life to a far larger extent than we imagine, but which it is precisely necessary to combine into a *single* gigantic flood. And this we must do. That this task can be accomplished is irrefutably proved by the enormous growth of the labour movement, and the greed with which the workers devour political literature, to which we have already referred above. Calls for terror, and calls to give the economic struggle itself a political character are merely two different forms of *evading* the most pressing duty that now rests upon Russian revolutionaries, namely, to organise an all-sided political agitation. *Svoboda* desires to *substitute* terror for agitation, although it openly admits that "as soon as intensified and strenuous agitation is commenced among the masses its excitative function will be finished." [*The Regeneration of Revolutionism*, p. 68.] This proves precisely that both the terrorists and the Economists *underestimate* the revolutionary activity of the masses, in spite of the striking evidence of the events that took place in the spring,* and whereas one goes out in search of artificial "stimulants" the other talks about "concrete demands." But both fail to devote sufficient attention to the development *of their own activity* in political agitation and organisation of political exposures. And no other work can serve as a *substitute* for this work, either at the present time, or at any other time.

E. The Working Class as Champion of Democracy

We have seen that the organisation of wide political agitation, and consequently, of all-sided political exposures are an absolutely

* This refers to the big street demonstrations which commenced in the spring of 1901.

necessary *and paramount* task of activity, that is, if that activity is to be truly Social-Democratic. We arrived at this conclusion *solely* on the grounds of the pressing needs of the working class for political knowledge and political training. But this ground by itself is too narrow for the presentation of the question, for it ignores the general democratic tasks of Social-Democracy as a whole, and of modern, Russian Social-Democracy in particular. In order to explain the situation more concretely we shall approach the subject from an aspect that is "nearer" to the Economist, namely, from the practical aspect. "Every one agrees" that it is necessary to develop the political consciousness of the working class. But the question arises, How is that to be done? What must be done to bring this about? The economic struggle merely brings the workers "up against" questions concerning the attitude of the government towards the working class. Consequently, *however much we may try* to "give to the economic struggle itself a political character" *we shall never be able* to develop the political consciousness of the workers (to the degree of Social-Democratic consciousness) by confining ourselves to the economic struggle, for *the limits of this task are too narrow.* The Martynov formula has some value for us, not because it illustrates Martynov's abilities to confuse things, but because it strikingly expresses the fundamental error that all the Economists commit, namely, their conviction that it is possible to develop the class political consciousness of the workers *from within,* that is to say, exclusively, or at least mainly, by means of the economic struggle. Such a view is radically wrong. Piqued by our opposition to them, the Economists refuse to ponder deeply over the origins of these disagreements, with the result that we absolutely fail to understand each other. It is as if we spoke in different tongues.

The workers can acquire class political consciousness *only from without,* that is, only outside of the economic struggle, outside of the sphere of relations between workers and employers. The sphere from which alone it is possible to obtain this knowledge is the sphere of relationships between *all* classes and the state and the government—the sphere of the inter-relations between *all* classes. For that reason, the reply to the question: What must be done in order that the workers may acquire political knowledge? cannot be merely the one which, in the majority of cases, the practical workers, especially those who are inclined towards Economism, usually content themselves with, *i. e.,* "go among the workers." To bring

political knowledge to the workers the Social-Democrats must *go among all classes of the population,* must despatch units of their army *in all directions.*

We deliberately select this awkward formula, we deliberately express ourselves in a simple, forcible way, not because we desire to indulge in paradoxes, but in order to "stimulate" the Economists to take up their tasks which they unpardonably ignore, to make them understand the difference between trade-union and Social-Democratic politics, which they refuse to understand. Therefore, we beg the reader not to get excited, but to hear us patiently to the end.

Take the type of Social-Democratic circle that has been most widespread during the past few years, and examine its work. It has "contact with the workers," it issues leaflets—in which, abuses in the factories, the government's partiality towards the capitalists, and the tyranny of the police are strongly condemned—and rests content with this. At meetings of workers, there are either no discussions or they do not extend beyond such subjects. Lectures and discussions on the history of the revolutionary movement, on questions of the home and foreign policy of our government, on questions of the economic evolution of Russia and of Europe, and the position of the various classes in modern society, etc., are extremely rare. Of systematically acquiring and extending contact with other classes of society, no one even dreams. The ideal leader, as the majority of the members of such circles picture him, is something more in the nature of a trade-union secretary than a Socialist political leader. Any trade-union secretary, an English one, for instance, helps the workers to conduct the economic struggle, helps to expose factory abuses, explains the injustice of the laws and of measures which hamper the freedom of strikes and the freedom to picket, to warn all and sundry that a strike is proceeding at a certain factory, explains the partiality of arbitration courts which are in the hands of the bourgeois classes, etc., etc. In a word, every trade-union secretary conducts and helps to conduct "the economic struggle against the employers and the government." It cannot be too strongly insisted that *this is not* enough to constitute Social-Democracy. The Social-Democrat's ideal should not be a trade-union secretary, but *a tribune of the people,* able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression, no matter where it takes place, no matter what stratum or class of the people it affects; he must be able to group all these manifestations into a single picture of

police violence and capitalist exploitation; he must be able to take advantage of every petty event in order to explain his Socialistic convictions and his Social-Democratic demands *to all*, in order to explain to *all* and every one the world historical significance of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat.

Compare, for example, a leader like Robert Knight (the celebrated secretary and leader of the Boiler Makers Society, one of the most powerful trade unions in England) with Wilhelm Liebknecht, and then take the contrasts that Martynov draws in his controversy with *Iskra*. You will see—I am running through Martynov's article—that Robert Knight engaged more in "calling the masses to certain concrete actions" [p. 39] while Liebknecht engaged more in "the revolutionary explanation of the whole of modern society, or various manifestations of it" [pp. 38-39]; that Robert Knight "formulated the immediate demands of the proletariat and pointed to the manner in which they can be achieved" [p. 41], whereas Wilhelm Liebknecht, while doing this "simultaneously guided the activities of various opposition strata," "dictated to them a positive programme of action" [p. 41]; * that it was precisely Robert Knight who strove "as far as possible to give to the economic struggle itself a political character" [p. 42] and was excellently able "to submit to the government concrete demands promising certain palpable results" [p. 43], while Liebknecht engaged more in "one-sided exposures" [p. 40]; that Robert Knight attached more significance to the "forward march of the drab, every-day struggle" [p. 61], while Liebknecht engaged more in the "propaganda of brilliant and finished ideas" [p. 61]; that Liebknecht converted the paper he was directing into "an organ of revolutionary opposition exposing the present system and particularly the political conditions which came into conflict with the interests of the most varied strata of the population" [p. 63], whereas Robert Knight "worked for the cause of labour in close organic contact with the proletarian struggle" [p. 63]—if by "close and organic contact" is meant the subservience to spontaneity which we studied above from the example of Krichevsky and Martynov—and "restricted the sphere of his influence," convinced, of course, as is Martynov, that "by that he intensified that influence" [p. 63]. In a word, you will see

* For example, during the Franco-Prussian War, Liebknecht dictated a programme of action *for the whole of democracy*—and this was done to an even greater extent by Marx and Engels in 1848.

that *de facto*, Martynov reduces Social-Democracy to the level of trade unionism, and he does this, of course, not because he does not desire the good of Social-Democracy, but simply because he was a little too much in a hurry to make Plekhanov more profound, instead of taking the trouble to understand him.

Let us return, however, to the elucidation of our thesis. We said that a Social-Democrat, if he really believes it is necessary to develop the political consciousness of the proletariat, must "go among all classes of the people." This gives rise to the questions: How is this to be done? Have we enough forces to do this? Is there a base for such work among all the other classes? Will this not mean a retreat, or lead to a retreat from the class point-of-view? We shall deal with these questions.

We must "go among all classes of the people" as theoreticians, as propagandists, as agitators, and as organisers. No one doubts that the theoretical work of Social-Democrats should be directed towards studying all the features of the social and political position of the various classes. But extremely little is done in this direction compared with the work that is done in studying the features of factory life. In the committees and circles, you will meet men who are immersed say in the study of some special branch of the metal industry, but you will hardly ever find members of organisations (obliged, as often happens, for some reason or other to give up practical work) especially engaged in the collection of material concerning some pressing question of social and political life which could serve as a means for conducting Social-Democratic work among other strata of the population. In speaking of the lack of training of the majority of present-day leaders of the labour movement, we cannot refrain from mentioning the point about training in this connection also, for it is also bound up with the "economic" conception of "close organic contact with the proletarian struggle." The principal thing, of course, is *propaganda and agitation* among all strata of the people. The Western-European Social-Democrats find their work in this field facilitated by the calling of public meetings, to which *all* are free to go, and by the parliament, in which they speak to the representatives of *all* classes. We have neither a parliament, nor the freedom to call meetings, nevertheless we are able to arrange meetings of workers who desire to listen to *a Social-Democrat.* We must also find ways and means of calling meetings of representatives of all and every other class of the

population that desire to listen to a *Democrat;* for he who forgets that "the Communists support every revolutionary movement," that we are obliged for that reason to emphasize *general democratic tasks before the whole people,* without for a moment concealing our Socialistic convictions, is not a Social-Democrat. He who forgets his obligation to *be in advance of everybody* in bringing up, sharpening and solving *every* general democratic question, is not a Social-Democrat.

"But everybody agrees with this!"—the impatient reader will exclaim—and the new instructions given by the last congress of the League to the Editorial Board of *Rabocheye Dyelo* says: "All events of social and political life that affect the proletariat either directly as a special class or *as the vanguard of all the revolutionary forces in the struggle for freedom* should serve as subjects for political propaganda and agitation." [*Two Congresses*, p. 17, our italics.]

Yes, these are very true and very good words and we would be satisfied if *Rabocheye Dyelo understood them, and if it refrained from saying in the next breath things that are the very opposite to them.* Surely, it is not sufficient to call ourselves the "vanguard," it is necessary to act like one; we must act in such a way that all the other units of the army shall see us, and be obliged to admit that we are the vanguard. And we ask the reader: Are the representatives of the other "units" such fools as to take merely our word for it when we say that we are the "vanguard"?

Just picture to yourselves the following: A Social-Democrat comes into the "unit" of Russian educated radicals, or liberal constitutionalists, and declares to them: We are the vanguard; "at the present time we are confronted by the problem of—how to give as far as possible to the economic struggle itself a political character." The radical, or constitutionalist, if he is at all intelligent (and there are many intelligent men among Russian radicals and constitutionalists), would only laugh at such a speech, and would say (to himself, of course, for in the majority of cases they are experienced diplomats):

Well, your "vanguard" must be composed of simpletons! It does not even understand that it is our task, the task of the progressive representatives of bourgeois democracy to give to the economic struggle of the workers a political character. Why, we too, like all the West-European bourgeoisie, are striving to draw the workers into politics, but *only into trade-union politics and not into Social-Democratic politics.* Trade-union politics are precisely *bourgeois politics* of the working class and the "vanguard's" formulation of its tasks is the formula for trade-union politics. Let them call them-

selves Social-Democrats if they like, I am not a child to get excited over a label. But see that they do not fall under the influence of those pernicious orthodox doctrinaires, let them allow "freedom of criticism" to those who unconsciously are driving Social-Democracy into trade-unionist channels.

And the light chuckle of our constitutionalist will turn into Homeric laughter when he learns that the Social-Democrats who talk about Social-Democracy being the vanguard at the present time, when spontaneity completely dominates our movement, fears nothing so much as "belittling the spontaneous elements," as "belittling the significance of the forward march of the drab, every-day struggle, as compared with the propaganda of brilliant and finished ideas," etc., etc! A "vanguard," which fears that consciousness will outstrip spontaneity, which fears to put forward a bold "plan" that would compel universal recognition even among those who think differently from us—Are they not confusing the word "vanguard" with the word "rearguard"?

Ponder over the following piece of Martynov reasoning. On page 42 he says that *Iskra's* tactics of exposing abuses are one-sided, that "however much we may spread distrust and hatred towards the government, we shall not achieve our aim until we have succeeded in developing sufficiently active social energy for its overthrow." This, it may be said in parenthesis, is the concern we have already met with for increasing the activity of the masses, while at the same time striving to restrict its activity. This is not the point we are now discussing, however. Martynov, therefore, speaks of *revolutionary* energy ("for its overthrow"). But what conclusion does he arrive at? As in ordinary times, various social strata inevitably march separately, therefore,

In view of that, it is clear that we Social-Democrats cannot simultaneously guide the activities of various opposition strata, we cannot dictate to them a positive programme of action, we cannot point out to them in what manner they can fight for their daily interests. . . . The liberal strata will themselves take care of the active struggle for their immediate interests and this struggle will bring them up against our political régime.

Thus, having commenced by speaking about revolutionary energy —of the active struggle for the overthrow of the autocracy, Martynov immediately turned towards trade-union energy and active struggle for immediate interests! It goes without saying that we cannot guide the struggle of the students, liberals, etc., for their "immediate interests," but this is not the point we were arguing

about, most worthy Economists! The point we were discussing is the possible and necessary participation of various social strata in the overthrow of the autocracy; not only are we able, but it is our duty to guide *these* "activities, of the various opposition strata" if we desire to be a "vanguard." Not only will the students and our liberals, etc., take care of the struggle that will bring them up against our political régime; the police and the officials of the autocratic government will see to this more than any one. But, if "we" desire to be advanced democrats, we must make it our business to *stimulate* in the minds of those who are dissatisfied only with university or only with Zemstvo, etc., conditions the idea that the whole political system is worthless. We must take upon ourselves the task of organising a universal political struggle under the leadership of *our party* in such a manner as to obtain the support of all opposition strata for the struggle and for our party. We must train our Social-Democratic practical workers to become political leaders, able to guide all the manifestations of this universal struggle, able at the right time to "dictate a positive programme of action" for the discontented students, for the discontented Zemstvo, for the discontented religious sects, for the offended elementary school teachers, etc., etc. For that reason, Martynov's assertion that "with regard to these, we can come forward merely in *the negative* rôle of exposers of abuses . . . we can *only* dissipate the hopes they have in various government commissions"—*is absolutely wrong* (our italics). By saying this Martynov shows that *he absolutely fails to understand* the rôle the revolutionary "vanguard" must really play. If the reader bears this in mind, the *real sense* of the following concluding remarks by Martynov will be clear to him:

> *Iskra* is the organ of the revolutionary opposition which exposes the abuses of our system—particularly political abuses, in so far as they affect the interests of the most diverse classes of the population. We, however, are working and will continue to work for the cause of labour in close organic contact with the proletarian struggle. By restricting the sphere of our influence, we at the same time intensify that influence.

The true sense of this conclusion is as follows: *Iskra* desires to elevate working-class trade-union politics (to which, owing to misunderstanding, lack of training, or by conviction our practical workers frequently confine themselves) to Social-Democratic politics, whereas *Rabocheye Dyelo* desires to *degrade* Social-Democratic politics to trade-union politics. And while doing this, they assure the

world that these two positions are "quite compatible in the common cause." *O! sancta simplicitas!*

To proceed. Have we sufficient forces to be able to direct our propaganda and agitation among *all* classes of the population? Of course we have. Our Economists are frequently inclined to deny this. They lose sight of the gigantic progress our movement has made from (approximately) 1894 to 1901. Like real Khvostists, they frequently live in the distant past, in the period of the beginning of the movement. At that time, indeed, we had astonishingly few forces, and it was perfectly natural and legitimate then to resolve to go exclusively among the workers, and severely condemn any deviation from this. The whole task then was to consolidate our position in the working class. At the present time, however, gigantic forces have been attracted to the movement; the best representatives of the young generation of the educated classes are coming over to us; everywhere, and in all provinces, there are people who have taken part in the movement in the past, who desire to do so now, who are striving towards Social-Democracy, but who are obliged to sit idle because we cannot employ them (in 1894 you could count the Social-Democrats on your fingers). One of the principal political and organisational shortcomings of our movement is that we are *unable* to utilise all these forces, and give them appropriate work (we shall deal with this in detail in the next chapter). The overwhelming majority of these forces entirely lack the opportunity for "going to the workers," so there are no grounds for fearing that we shall deflect forces from our main cause. And in order to be able to provide the workers with real, universal, and live political knowledge, we must have "our own men," Social-Democrats, everywhere, among all social strata, and in all positions from which we can learn the inner springs of our state mechanism. Such men are required for propaganda and agitation, but in a still larger measure for organisation.

Is there scope for activity among all classes of the population? Those who fail to see this also lag intellectually behind the spontaneous awakening of the masses. The labour movement has aroused and is continuing to arouse discontent in some, hopes for support for the opposition in others, and the consciousness of the intolerableness and inevitable downfall of autocracy in still others. We would be "politicians" and Social-Democrats only in name (as very often happens), if we failed to realise that our task is to

utilise every manifestation of discontent, and to collect and utilise every grain of even rudimentary protest. This is quite apart from the fact that many millions of the peasantry, handicraftsmen, petty artisans, etc., always listen eagerly to the preachings of any Social-Democrat who is at all intelligent. Is there a single class of the population in which no individuals, groups or circles are to be found who are discontented with the state of tyranny, and therefore accessible to the propaganda of Social-Democrats as the spokesmen of the most pressing general democratic needs? To those who desire to have a clear idea of what the political agitation of a Social-Democrat *among all* classes and strata of the population should be like, we would point to *political exposures* in the broad sense of the word as the principal (but of course not the sole) form of this agitation.

We must "arouse in every section of the population that is at all enlightened a passion for *political* exposure," I wrote in my article "Where to Begin" (*Iskra,* No. 4, May, 1901), with which I shall deal in greater detail later.

"We must not allow ourselves to be discouraged by the fact that the voice of political exposure is still feeble, rare and timid. This is not because of a general submission to political despotism, but because those who are able and ready to expose have no tribune from which to speak, because there is no audience to listen eagerly to and approve of what the orators say, and because the latter can nowhere perceive among the people forces to whom it would be worth while directing their complaint against the 'omnipotent' Russian government. . . . We are now in a position to set up a tribune for the national exposure of the tsarist government, and it is our duty to do so. That tribune must be a Social-Democratic paper. . . ." *

The ideal audience for these political exposures is the working class, which is first and foremost in need of universal and live political knowledge, which is most capable of converting this knowledge into active struggle, even if it did not promise "palpable results." The only platform from which *public* exposures can be made is an All-Russian newspaper. "Unless we have a political organ, a movement deserving the name of political is inconceivable in modern Europe." In this connection Russia must undoubtedly be included in modern Europe. The press has long ago become a power in our country, otherwise the government would not spend tens of thousands of rubles to bribe it, and to subsidise the Katkovs, and Meshcherskys. And it is no novelty in autocratic Russia for the underground press to break through the wall of censorship and

* See p. 113, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

compel the legal and conservative press to speak openly of it. This was the case in the seventies and even in the fifties. How much broader and deeper are now the strata of the people willing to read the illegal underground press, and to learn from it "how to live and how to die," to use the expression of the worker who sent a letter to *Iskra* [No. 7].[206] Political exposures are as much a declaration of war against the *government* as economic exposures are a declaration of war against the employers. And the wider and more powerful this campaign of exposure will be, the more numerous and determined the social *class* which has *declared war in order to commence the war* will be, the greater will be the moral significance of this declaration of war. Hence, political exposures in themselves serve as a powerful instrument for *disintegrating* the system we oppose, the means for diverting from the enemy his casual or temporary allies, the means for spreading enmity and distrust among those who permanently share power with the autocracy.

Only a party that will *organise* real all-national exposures can become the vanguard of the revolutionary forces in our time. The word all-national has a very profound meaning. The overwhelming majority of the non-working class exposers (and in order to become the vanguard, we must attract other classes) are sober politicians and cool business men. They know perfectly well how dangerous it is to "complain" even against a minor official, let alone against the "omnipotent" Russian government. And they will come *to us* with their complaints only when they see that these complaints really have effect, and when they see that we represent a *political* force. In order to become this political force in the eyes of outsiders, much persistent and stubborn work is required to *increase* our own consciousness, initiative and energy. For this, it is not sufficient to stick the label "vanguard" on "rearguard" theory and practice.

But if we have to undertake the organisation of the real all-national exposure of the government, then in what way will the class character of our movement be expressed?—the over-zealous advocates of "close organic contact with the proletarian struggle" will ask us. The reply is: In that we *Social-Democrats* will organise these public exposures; in that all the questions that are brought up by the agitation will be explained in the spirit of Social-Democracy, without any deliberate or unconscious distortions of Marxism; in the fact that *the party* will carry on this universal political agitation,

uniting into one inseparable whole the pressure upon the government in the name of the whole people, the revolutionary training of the proletariat—while preserving its political independence—the guidance of the economic struggle of the working class, the utilisation of all its spontaneous conflicts with its exploiters, which rouse and bring into our camp increasing numbers of the proletariat!

But one of the characteristic features of Economism is its failure to understand this connection. More than that—it fails to understand the identity between the most pressing needs of the proletariat (an all-sided political education through the medium of political agitation and political exposures), and the need for a general democratic movement. This lack of understanding is not only expressed in "Martynovist" phrases, but also in the alleged class point-of-view which is identical in thought with these phrases. The following, for example, is how the authors of the Economic Letter in No. 12 of *Iskra* expressed themselves.*

> This fundamental drawback [overestimating ideology] is the cause of *Iskra's* inconsistency in regard to the question of the relations between Social-Democrats and various social classes and tendencies. By a process of theoretical reasoning [and not by "the growth of party tasks which grow together with the party"], *Iskra* arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary immediately to take up the struggle against absolutism, but in all probability sensing the difficulty of this task for the workers in the present state of affairs [not only sensing, but knowing perfectly well that this problem will seem less difficult to the workers than to those Economist intellectuals who are concerned about little children, for the workers are prepared to fight even for demands which, to use the language of the never-to-be-forgotten Martynov, do not "promise palpable results"] and lacking the patience to wait until the working class has accumulated sufficient forces for this struggle, *Iskra* begins to seek for allies in the ranks of the liberals and intellectuals.

Yes, yes, we have indeed lost all "patience" to "wait" for the blessed time that has long been promised us by the "conciliators," when the Economists will stop throwing the blame for their *own* backwardness upon the workers, and stop justifying their own lack of energy by the alleged lack of energy of the workers. We ask our Economists: What does "the workers accumulating forces for the

* Lack of space has prevented us from replying in full to this letter extremely characteristic of the Economist. We were very glad this letter appeared, for the charges brought against *Iskra*, that it did not maintain a consistent, class point-of-view, have reached us long ago from various sources, and we waited for an appropriate opportunity, or for a formulated expression of this fashionable charge, in order to reply to it. And it is our habit to reply to attacks, not by defence, but by counter-attacks.

struggle" mean? Is it not evident that it means the political training of the workers by revealing to them *all* the aspects of our despicable autocracy? And is it not clear that *precisely for this work* we need "allies in the ranks of the liberals and intelligentsia," who are prepared to join us in the exposure of the political attack on the Zemstvo, on the teachers, on the statisticians, on the students, etc? Is this "cunning mechanism" so difficult to understand after all? Did not P. B. Axelrod repeat to you over and over again since 1897: "The problem of the Russian Social-Democrats acquiring direct and indirect allies from among the non-proletarian classes will be solved principally by the character of the propagandist activities conducted among the proletariat itself?" [207] And Martynov and the other Economists continue to imagine that the workers must *at first* accumulate forces (for trade-union politics) in the economic struggle with the employers and the government, and *then* "go over [we suppose from trade-union "training for activity"] to Social-Democratic activity."

. . . In its quest, continue the Economists, *Iskra* "not infrequently departs from the class point-of-view, obscures class antagonisms and puts into the forefront the general discontent prevailing against the government, notwithstanding the fact that the causes and the degree of this discontent vary very considerably among the 'allies.' Such, for example, is *Iskra's* attitude towards the Zemstvo. . . ."

Iskra it is alleged promises those who are discontented with the government's doles to the nobility the aid of the working class, but does not say a word about the class differences among these strata of the people. If the reader will turn to the series of articles "The Autocracy and the Zemstvo [Nos. 2 and 4 of *Iskra*] [208] to which, *in all probability*, the author of the letter refers, he will find that these articles * deal with the attitude of the *government* towards the "mild agitation of the feudal-bureaucratic Zemstvo," and towards the "independent activity of even the propertied classes." In these articles it is stated that the workers cannot look on indifferently while the government is carrying on a fight against the Zemstvo, and the latter are called upon to give up making soft speeches, but to speak firmly and resolutely when revolutionary Social-Democracy confronts the government in all its strength. What there is in this that

* *Among* these articles there was one (*Iskra*, No. 3) especially dealing with the class antagonisms in rural districts. [See p. 101, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*]

the authors of the letter do not agree with is not clear. Do they think that the workers will "not understand" the phrases "propertied classes" and "feudal-bureaucratic Zemstvo"? Do they think that *stimulating* the Zemstvo to abandon soft speeches and to speak firmly and resolutely is "over-estimating ideology"? Do they imagine that the workers can accumulate "forces" for the fight against absolutism if they know nothing about the attitude of absolutism towards the Zemstvo? All this remains unknown. One thing alone is clear and that is that the authors of the letter have a very vague idea of what the political tasks of Social-Democracy are. This is revealed still more clearly by their remark: "Such also is *Iskra's* attitude towards the student movements" (*i. e.*, also "obscures class antagonism"). Instead of calling upon the workers to declare by means of public demonstrations that the real centre of unbridled violence and outrage is not the students but the Russian government [*Iskra*, No. 2],* we ought, no doubt, to have inserted arguments in the spirit of *Rabochaya Mysl.* And such ideas were expressed by Social-Democrats in the autumn of 1901, after the events of February and March, on the eve of a fresh student up-grade movement, which revealed that even in this sphere the "spontaneous" protest against autocracy is "*outstripping*" the conscious Social-Democratic leadership of the movement. The spontaneous striving of the workers to defend the students, who were being beaten up by the police and the Cossacks, is outstripping the conscious activity of the Social-Democratic organisations!

"And yet in other articles," continue the authors of the letter, "*Iskra* 'condemns' all 'compromises,' and 'defends,' for example, the intolerant conduct of the Guesdists." We would advise those who so conceitedly and frivolously declare—usually in connection with the disagreements existing among the contemporary Social-Democrats—that the disagreements are not essential and would not justify a split, to ponder very deeply over these words. Is it possible for those who say that we have done astonishingly little to explain the hostility of the autocracy towards the various classes, and to inform the workers of the opposition of the various strata of the population towards autocracy, to work successfully in one organisation with those who say that such work is "compromise"—evidently compromise with the theory of the "economic struggle against the employers and the government"?

* See p. 70, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

We urged the necessity of introducing the class struggle in the rural districts on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the emancipation of the peasantry (No. 3),* and of the irreconcilability between the local government bodies and the autocracy in connection with Witte's secret memorandum (No. 4).[209] We attacked the feudal landlords and the government which served the latter on the occasion of the passing of the law (No. 8),** and welcomed the secret Zemstvo congress that was held. We urged the Zemstvo to stop making degrading petitions [No. 8],[210] and to come out in the open to fight. We encouraged the students, who began to understand the necessity for the political struggle and began to take up that struggle [No. 3],[211] and at the same time, we lashed out at the "barbarous lack of understanding" revealed by the adherents of the "purely student" movement, who called upon the students to abstain from taking part in the street demonstrations (No. 3, in connection with the manifesto issued by the Executive Committee of the Moscow students on February 25). We exposed the "senseless dreams" and the "lying hypocrisy" of the cunning liberals of *Rossiya*[212] [No. 5],[213] and at the same time we commented on the savage acts of the government's torture chambers where "peaceful writers, aged professors, and scientists and the liberal Zemstvo were cruelly dealt with" [No. 5, "The Police Raid on Literature"]. We exposed the real significance of the programme of the "concern of the government for the welfare of the workers," and welcomed the "valuable admission" that "it is better by granting reforms from above to forestall the demand for such reforms from below, than to wait for those demands to be put forward" [No. 6].*** We encouraged the protests of the statisticians [No. 7],[214] and censured the strike-breaking statisticians [No. 9].[215] He who sees in these tactics the obscuring of the class consciousness of the proletariat and *compromise with liberalism* shows that he absolutely fails to understand the true significance of the programme of the *Credo* and *de facto is carrying out that programme,* however much he may deny this! Because, by that he is dragging Social-Democracy towards the "economic struggle against the employers and the government" but *shies at liberalism,* abandons the task of actively intervening *in every*

* See p. 101, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*
** See p. 176, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*
*** See p. 164, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

"liberal" question and defining *his own* Social-Democratic attitude towards such questions.

F. Again "Slanderers," Again "Mystifiers"

As the reader will remember, these polite expressions were uttered by *Rabocheye Dyelo* * which in this way answers to our charge that it "indirectly prepared the ground for converting the labour movement into an instrument of bourgeois democracy." In its simplicity of heart *Rabocheye Dyelo* decided that this accusation was nothing more than a polemical sally, as if to say, these malicious doctrinaires can only think of saying unpleasant things about us; now what can be more unpleasant than being an instrument of bourgeois democracy? And so they print in heavy type a "refutation": "Nothing but downright slander" [*Two Congresses*, p. 30], "mystification" [p. 31] "masquerade" [p. 33]. Like Jupiter, *Rabocheye Dyelo* (although it has little resemblance to Jupiter) is angry because it is wrong, and proves by its hasty abuse that it is incapable of understanding its opponents' mode of reasoning. And yet, with only a little reflection, it would have understood why subservience to the spontaneity of the mass movement and any degrading of Social-Democratic politics to trade-union politics mean precisely to prepare the ground for converting the labour movement into an instrument of bourgeois democracy. The spontaneous labour movement is able by itself to create (and inevitably will create) only trade unionism, and working-class trade-union politics are precisely working-class bourgeois politics. The fact that the working class participates in the political struggle and even in political revolution does not in itself make its politics Social-Democratic politics. Will *Rabocheye Dyelo* deny that? Will it at last openly and without equivocation explain its position on the urgent questions of the international and of the Russian Social-Democratic movement? Oh no, it never thinks of doing anything of the kind, because it holds fast to the trick, which might be described as telling it in "negatives": "It's not me; it's not my horse; I'm not the driver," ** We are not Economists; *Rabochaya Mysl* does not stand for Economism; there is no Economism at all

* See p. 164, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

** A popular version of the excuses offered by a gipsy caught with a stolen horse.—*Ed.*

in Russia. This is a remarkably adroit and "political" trick, which suffers from this little defect, however, that the bodies that practice it are usually dubbed with the nickname: "Anything you wish, sir." *

Rabocheye Dyelo imagines that bourgeois democracy in Russia is merely a "phantom" [*Two Congresses*, p. 32].** Happy people! Like the ostrich, they bury their heads in the sand, and imagine that everything around has disappeared. A number of liberal publicists who month after month proclaimed to the world their triumph over the collapse and even disappearance of Marxism; a number of liberal newspapers (*St. Peterburgskiye Vyedomosti, Russkiye Vyedomosti* and many others) which encourage the liberals who bring to the workers the Brentano conception of the class struggle and the trade-union conception of politics—the galaxy of critics of Marxism, whose real tendencies were so very well disclosed by the *Credo* and whose literary products alone circulate freely in Russia—the animation among revolutionary *non*-Social-Democratic tendencies, particularly after the February and March events—all these, of course, are mere phantoms! Of course, it has nothing at all to do with bourgeois democracy!

Rabocheye Dyelo and the authors of the Economic Letter published in *Iskra* No. 12, should "ponder over the question as to why the events in the spring excited such animation among the revolutionary non-Social-Democratic tendencies instead of increasing the authority and the prestige of Social-Democracy. The reason was that we failed to cope with our tasks. The masses of the workers proved to be more active than we, we lacked adequately trained revolutionary leaders and organisers aware of the mood prevailing among all the oppositional strata and able to march at the head of the movement, convert the spontaneous demonstration into a political demonstration, broaden its political character, etc. Under such circumstances, our backwardness will inevitably be taken advantage of by the more mobile and more energetic non-Social-

* Suggesting that they are subservient.—*Ed.*

** This is a reference to the "concrete Russian conditions which fatalistically impel the labour movement on the revolutionary path." But these people refuse to understand that the revolutionary path of the labour movement might not be a Social-Democratic path! When absolutism reigned in Western Europe, the entire Western European bourgeoisie "impelled" and deliberately impelled the workers on the path of revolution. We, Social-Democrats, however, cannot be satisfied with that. And if we, by any means whatever, degrade Social-Democratic politics to the level of spontaneous trade-union politics, we, by that, play into the hands of bourgeois democracy.

Democratic revolutionists, and the workers, no matter how strenuously and self-sacrificingly they may fight the police and the troops, no matter how revolutionary they may act, will prove to be merely the rearguard of bourgeois democracy, and not the vanguard of Social-Democracy. Take, for example, the German Social-Democrats, whose weak sides alone our Economists desire to emulate. Why is it that *not a single* political event takes place in Germany without adding to the authority and prestige of Social-Democracy? Because Social-Democracy is always found to be in advance of all others in their revolutionary estimation of any event and in their championship of every protest against tyranny. It does not soothe itself by arguments about the economic struggle bringing the workers up against their own lack of rights, and about concrete conditions fatalistically impelling the labour movement on the path of revolution. It intervenes in every sphere and in every question of social and political life. In the matter of Wilhelm's refusal to endorse a bourgeois progressive as city mayor (our Economists have not yet managed to convince the Germans that this in fact is a compromise with liberalism!); in the question of the law against the publication of "immoral" publications and pictures; in the question of the government's influencing the election of the professors, etc., etc. Everywhere Social-Democracy is found to be ahead of all others, rousing political discontent among all classes, rousing the sluggards, pushing on the laggards and providing a wealth of material for the development of the political consciousness and political activity of the proletariat. The result of all this is that even the avowed enemies of Socialism are filled with respect for this advanced political fighter and sometimes an important document from bourgeois and even from bureaucratic and Court circles makes its way by some miraculous means into the editorial office of *Vorwaerts*.

This, then, is the explanation of the seeming "contradiction" that passes the understanding of *Rabocheye Dyelo* to such an extent that it raises its arms and cries: "Masquerade"! Is it not a shocking thing: We, *Rabocheye Dyelo*, place the mass labour movement as the **cornerstone** (and printed in heavy type!); we warn all and sundry against belittling the significance of the spontaneous movement; we desire to give the economic struggle itself, *itself*, *itself*, a political character; we desire to maintain close and organic contact with the proletarian struggle! And yet we are told that we are

preparing the ground for converting the labour movement into an instrument of bourgeois democracy! And who says this? People who "compromise" with liberalism, intervene in every "liberal" question (what a gross misunderstanding of the "organic contacts with the proletarian struggle"!), who devote so much attention to the students and even (Oh horror!) to the Zemstvoists! People who wish to devote a greater (compared with the Economists) percentage of their efforts to activity among non-proletarian classes of the population! Is not this a "masquerade"?

Poor *Rabocheye Dyelo!* Will it ever find the solution of this complicated puzzle?

IV

THE PRIMITIVENESS OF THE ECONOMISTS AND THE ORGANISATION OF REVOLUTIONISTS

Rabocheye Dyelo's assertions—which we have analysed—that the economic struggle is the most widely applicable means of political agitation and that our task now is to give the economic struggle itself a political character, etc., not only express a restricted view of our political tasks, but also of our *organisational tasks.* The "economic struggle against the employers and the government" does not in the least require—and therefore such a struggle can never give rise to—an All-Russian centralised organisation that will combine, in a general attack, all the numerous manifestations of political opposition, protest and indignation, an organisation that will consist of professional revolutionaries and be led by the real political leaders of the whole people. And this can be easily understood. The character of the organisation of every institution is naturally and inevitably determined by the character of the activity that institution conducts. Consequently, *Rabocheye Dyelo,* by the above-analysed assertions, not only sanctifies and legitimatises the narrowness of political activity, but also the narrowness of organisational work. And in this case also, as always, its consciousness shrinks before spontaneity. And yet, subservience to spontaneously rising forms of organisation, the lack of appreciation of the narrowness and primitiveness of our organisational work, of our "primitive methods" in this most important sphere, the lack of such appreciation, I say, is a very serious complaint that our movement suffers from. It is not a complaint that comes with decline, of course, it is a complaint that comes with growth. But it is precisely at the present time, when the wave of spontaneous indignation is, as it were, lashing us leaders and organisers of the movement, that a most irreconcilable struggle must be carried on against all defence of sluggishness, against any legitimisation of restriction in this matter, and it is particularly necessary to rouse in all those participating in the practical work, in all who are just thinking of taking it up, discontent with the *primitive methods* that prevail among us and unshakable determination to get rid of it.

A. What Are Primitive Methods?

We shall try to answer this question by describing the activity of a typical Social-Democratic circle of the period of 1894-1901. We have already referred to the manner in which the students became absorbed in Marxism at that period. Of course, these students were not so much interested in Marxism as a theory; they were interested in it because it provided the answer to the question: "What is to be done?"; because it was a call to march against the enemy. And these young warriors marched to battle with astonishingly primitive equipment and training. In a vast number of cases, they had almost no equipment, and absolutely no training. They marched to war like peasants from the plough, snatching up a club. A students' circle with no contacts with the old members of the movement, no contacts with circles in other districts, or even in other parts of the same city (or with other schools), without the various sections of the revolutionary work being in any way organised, having no systematic plan of activity covering any length of time, establishes contacts with the workers and sets to work. The circle gradually expands its propaganda and agitation; by its activities it wins the sympathies of a rather large circle of workers and of a certain section of the educated classes, which provides it with money and from which the "committee" recruits new groups of members. The fascination which the committee (or the League of Struggle) exercises on the youth increases, its sphere of activity becomes wider and its activities expand quite spontaneously: the very people who a year or a few months previously had spoken at the gatherings of the students' circles and discussed the question, "Whither?" who established and maintained contacts with the workers, wrote and published leaflets, established contacts with other groups of revolutionists and procured literature, now set to work to establish a local newspaper, begin to talk about organising demonstrations, and finally, commence open conflicts (these open conflicts may, according to circumstances, take the form of issuing the very first agitational leaflet, or the first newspaper, or of organising the first demonstration). And usually, the first action ends in immediate and complete defeat. Immediate and complete, precisely because these open conflicts were not the result of a systematic and carefully thought-out and gradually prepared plan for a prolonged and stubborn struggle, but simply the spontaneous

growth of traditional circle work; because naturally, the police, almost in every case, knew the principal leaders of the local movement, for they had already "recommended" themselves to the police in their school-days, and the latter only waited for a convenient day to make their raid. They gave the circle sufficient time to develop their work so that they may obtain a palpable *corpus delicti*,* and always allowed several of the persons known to them to remain at liberty for *razvodka* (which, I believe is the technical term used both by our people and by the gendarmes) ** One cannot help comparing this kind of warfare with that conducted by a mob of peasants armed with clubs against modern troops. One can only express astonishment at the virility displayed by the movement which expanded, grew and won victories in spite of the lack of training among the fighters. It is true that from the historical point-of-view, the primitiveness of equipment was not only inevitable at first, but even *legitimate* as one of the conditions for the wide recruiting of fighters, but as soon as serious operations commenced (and they commenced in fact with the strikes in the summer of 1896), the defects in our fighting organisations made themselves felt to an increasing extent. Thrown into consternation at first and committing a number of mistakes (for example, its appeal to the public describing the misdeeds of the Socialists, or the deportation of the workers from the capital to the provincial industrial centres) the government very soon adapted itself to the new conditions of the struggle and managed to place its perfectly equipped detachments of agent-provocateurs, spies, and gendarmes in the required places. Raids became so frequent, affected such a vast number of people, and cleared out the local circles so thoroughly, that the masses of the workers literally lost all their leaders, the movement assumed an incredibly sporadic character, and it became utterly impossible to establish continuity and connectedness in the work. The fact that the local active workers were hopelessly scattered, the casual manner in which the membership of the circles were recruited, the lack of training in and narrow outlook on theoretical, political and organisational questions were all the inevitable result of the conditions described above. Things reached such a pass

* Offence within the meaning of the law.—*Ed.*

** Literally for "breeding purposes," *i. e.*, to breed more victims for the police net. By allowing them to be at liberty and by shadowing their movements, the police were able to use them as innocent tools to betray the whereabouts of other revolutionists as yet unknown to them.—*Ed.*

that in several places the workers, because of our lack of stamina and ability to maintain secrecy, began to lose faith in the intelligentsia and to avoid them: The intellectuals, they said, are much too careless and lay themselves open to police raids!

Any one who has the slightest knowledge of the movement knows that these primitive methods at last began to be recognised as a disease by all thinking Social-Democrats. And in order that the reader, who is not acquainted with the movement, may have no grounds for thinking that we are "inventing" a special stage or special disease of the movement, we shall refer once again to the witness we have already quoted. No doubt we shall be excused for the length of the passage quoted:

> While the gradual transition to wider practical activity [writes B-v in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 6], a transition which is closely connected with the general transitional period through which the Russian labour movement is now passing, is a characteristic feature . . . there is, however, another and not less interesting feature in the general mechanism of the Russian workers' revolution. We refer to the *general lack of revolutionary forces fit for action* * which is felt not only in St. Petersburg, but throughout the whole of Russia. With the general revival of the labour movement, with the general development of the working masses, with the growing frequency of strikes, and with the mass labour struggle becoming more and more open, the intensification of government persecution, arrests, deportation and exile, *this lack of highly skilled revolutionary forces is becoming more and more marked* and, without a doubt, *must leave deep traces upon the general character of the movement.* Many strikes take place without the revolutionary organisations exercising any strong and direct influence upon them. . . . A shortage of agitational leaflets and illegal literature is felt. . . . The workers' circles are left without agitators. . . . Simultaneously, there is a constant shortage of funds. In a word, *the growth of the labour movement is outstripping the growth and development of the revolutionary organisations.* The numerical strength of the active revolutionists is too small to enable them to concentrate in themselves all the influence exercised upon the whole of the discontented masses of labour, or to give this unrest even a shadow of symmetry and organisation. . . . Separate circles, separate revolutionists, scattered, uncombined do not represent a united, strong and disciplined organisation with the planned development of its parts. . . .

Admitting that the immediate organisation of fresh circles to take the place of those that have been broken up, "merely proves the virility of the movement . . . but does not prove the existence of an adequate number of sufficiently fit revolutionary workers," the author concludes:

> The lack of practical training among the St. Petersburg revolutionists is seen in the results of their work. The recent trials, especially that of the Self-

* All italics ours.

Emancipation group and the Labour versus Capital group [216] clearly showed that the young agitator, unacquainted with the details of the conditions of labour and, consequently, unacquainted with the conditions under which agitation must he carried on in a given factory, ignorant of the principles of conspiracy, and understanding only the general principles of Social-Democracy [and it is a question whether he understands them] is ahle to carry on his work for perhaps four, five, or six months. Then come arrests, which frequently lead to the break-up of the whole organisation, or at all events, of part of it. The question arises, therefore, can the group conduct successful and fruitful activity if its existence is measured hy months? Ohviously, the defects of the existing organisations cannot he wholly ascribed to the transitional period. . . . Ohviously, the numerical and ahove all the qualitative strength of the organisations operating is not of little importance, and the first task our Social-Democrats must undertake is *effectively to combine the organisations and make a strict selection of their membership.*

B. Primitive Methods and Economism

We must now deal with the question that undoubtedly must have arisen in the mind of every reader. Have these primitive methods, which are a complaint of growth that affect *the whole of the movement,* any connection with Economism, which is *only one* of the tendencies in Russian Social-Democracy? We think that they have. The lack of practical training, the lack of ability to carry on organisational work is certainly common *to us all,* including those who have stood unswervingly by the point-of-view of revolutionary Marxism right from the very outset. And, of course, no one can blame the practical workers for their lack of practical training. But, the term "primitive methods" embraces something more than mere lack of training: It embraces the restrictedness of revolutionary work generally, the failure to understand that a good organisation of revolutionists cannot be built up on the basis of such restricted work, and lastly—and most important—it embraces the attempts to justify this restrictedness and to elevate it to a special "theory," *i. e.,* subservience to spontaneity in this matter also. As soon as such attempts were observed, it became certain that primitive methods are connected with Economism and that we shall never eliminate this restrictedness of our organisational activity until we eliminate Economism generally (*i. e.,* the narrow conception of Marxian theory, of the rôle of Social-Democracy, and of its political tasks). And these attempts were revealed in a two-fold direction. Some began to say: The labour masses have not yet themselves brought up the broad and militant tasks that the revolutionists desire to "impose" upon them; they must continue for the time being to

fight for *immediate* political demands, to conduct "the economic struggle against the employers and the government" * (this mass struggle "easily understood" by these masses naturally corresponds to an organisation "easily accessible" to the most untrained youth). Others, far removed from "gradualness" began to say: We can and must "bring about a political revolution," but there is no reason whatever for building a strong organisation of revolutionists that would train revolutionists for the stalwart and stubborn struggle, in order to bring this revolution about. All we need do is to snatch up the "easily understood" wooden club, the acquaintance with which we have already made. Speaking, without metaphor, it means—we must organise a general strike,** or we must stimulate the "spiritless" progress of the labour movement by means of "excitative terror." *** Both these tendencies, the opportunist and the "revolutionary," bow to the prevailing primitiveness; neither believe that it can be eliminated, neither understand our primary and most imperative practical task, namely, to establish *an organisation of revolutionists* capable of maintaining the energy, the stability and continuity of the political struggle.

We have just quoted the words of B-v: "The growth of the labour movement is outstripping the growth and development of the revolutionary organisations." This "valuable remark of a close observer" (*Rabocheye Dyelo's* comment on B-v's article) has a twofold value for us. It proves that we were right in our opinion that the principal cause of the present crisis in Russian Social-Democracy is that the *leaders* ("ideologists," revolutionists, Social-Democrats) *lag behind the spontaneous rising of the masses.* It shows that all the arguments advanced by the authors of the Economic Letter in *Iskra,* No. 12, by B. Krichevsky, and by Martynov, about the dangers of belittling the significance of the spontaneous elements, about the drab every-day struggles, about the tactics-process, etc., are nothing more than a glorification and defence of primitive methods. These people, who cannot pronounce the word "theoretician" without a contemptuous grimace, who describe their genuflections to common lack of training and ignorance as "sensitiveness

* *Rabochaya Mysl* and *Rabocheye Dyelo,* especially the *Reply* to Plekhanov.

** See *Who Will Bring About the Political Revolution?* A symposium published in Russia entitled, *The Proletarian Struggle.* Re-issued by the Kiev Committee.

****Regeneration of Revolutionism* and *Svoboda.*

to life," reveal in practice a failure to understand our most imperative *practical* task. To laggards they shout: Keep in step! don't run ahead! To people suffering from a lack of energy and initiative in organisational work, from lack of "plans" for wide and bold organisational work, they shout about the "tactics-process"! The most serious sin we commit is that we *degrade* our political and *our organisational* tasks to the level of immediate, "palpable," "concrete" interests of the every-day economic struggle; and yet they keep singing to us the old song: Give the economic struggle itself a political character. We say again: This kind of thing displays as much "sensitiveness to life" as was displayed by the hero in the popular fable who shouted to a passing funeral procession: May you never get to your destination.*

Recall the matchless, truly "Narcissus"-like superciliousness with which these wiseacres lectured Plekhanov about the "workers' *circles* generally" [*sic!*] being "incapable of fulfilling political tasks in the real and *practical* sense of the word, *i. e.*, in the sense of expedient and successful *practical* struggle for political demands." [*Rabocheye Dyelo's Reply*, p. 24.] There are circles and circles, gentlemen! Circles of "kustars," ** of course, are incapable of fulfilling political tasks and never will be, until they realise the primitiveness of their methods and abandon it. If besides this, these amateurs are enamoured of their primitive methods, and insist on writing the word "practical" in italics, and imagine that practicality demands that their tasks be degraded to the level of understanding of the most backward strata of the masses, then they are hopeless, of course, and certainly cannot *fulfil general political tasks.* But circles of heroes, like those formed by Alexeyev and Myshkin, Khalturin and Zhelyabov, are able to fulfil political tasks in the genuine and most practical sense of the term, because their passionate preaching meets with response among the spontaneously awakened masses, because their seething energy rouses a corresponding and sustained energy among the revolutionary class. Plekhanov was a thousand times right not only when he pointed to this revolutionary class, not only when he proved that its spontaneous awakening was inevitable, but also when he set the "work ers' circles" a great and lofty political task. But you refer to the mass movement that has sprung up since that time in order to

* This refers to a popular fable about "Ivan the Fool."—*Ed.*

** Kustars—handicraftsmen employing primitive methods in their work.—*Ed.*

degrade this task, in order to *curtail* the energy and scope of activity of the "workers' circles." If you are not amateurs enamoured of your primitive methods, what are you then? You clutch at your practicality, but you fail to see what every Russian practical worker knows, namely, the miracles that the energy, not only of circles, but even of individual persons is able to perform in the revolutionary cause. Or do you think that our movements cannot produce heroes like those that were produced by the movement in the seventies? If so, why do you think so? Because we lack training? But we are training ourselves, will train ourselves and we will be trained! Unfortunately it is true that scum has formed on the surface of the stagnant water of the "economic struggle against the employers and the government"; there are people among us who kneel in prayer to spontaneity, gazing with awe upon the "posteriors" of the Russian proletariat (as Plekhanov expresses it). But we will remove this scum. The time has come when Russian revolutionists, led by a genuine revolutionary theory, relying upon the genuinely revolutionary and spontaneously awakening class, can at last—at last!—rise to their full height and exert their giant strength to the utmost. All that is required in order that this may be so is that the masses of our practical workers and the still larger masses of those who dream of doing practical work even while still at school shall meet with scorn and ridicule any suggestion that may be made to degrade our political tasks, and to restrict the scope of our organisational work. And we will achieve that, don't you worry, gentlemen!

In the article, "Where to Begin," that I wrote in opposition to *Rabocheye Dyelo,* I said: "Tactics in relation to some special question, or in relation to some detail of party organisation may be changed in twenty-four hours; but views as to whether a militant organisation, and political agitation among the masses, is necessary at all times or not cannot be changed in twenty-four hours, or even in twenty-four months for that matter." * To this *Rabocheye Dyelo* replied: "This is the only charge *Iskra* has levelled against us that claims to be based on facts, and even that is totally without foundation. Readers of *Rabocheye Dyelo* know very well that right from the outset we not only called for political agitation, without

* See "Where to Begin," p. 110, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

waiting for the appearance of *Iskra* * . . ." [and while doing so, you said that it was "impossible to impose on the mass labour movement, or on the workers' circles, the primary political task of overthrowing absolutism," that the only task they could carry out was to struggle for immediate political demands, and that "immediate political demands are understood by the masses after a strike, or at all events, after a few strikes"] ". . . but in the publications that we procured from abroad for the comrades working in Russia, provided the *only* Social-Democratic political and agitational material . . ." [and this only Social-Democratic material, the only political agitation that was carried on by you at all widely, was based exclusively on the economic struggle, and you even went so far as to claim that this restricted agitation was "the most widely applicable." And you fail to observe, gentlemen, that your own arguments—that this was the only material provided—proves the necessity for *Iskra's* appearance, and proves how necessary it is for *Iskra* to oppose *Rabocheye Dyelo*]. ". . . On the other hand, our publishing activity really prepared the ground for the tactical unity of the party. . . ." [Unity in the conviction that tactics are a process of growth of party tasks that grow together with the party? A precious unity indeed!] ". . . and by that rendered possible the creation of a 'militant organisation' for which the League did all that an organisation abroad could do." [*Rabocheye Dyelo,* No. 10, p. 15.] A vain attempt at evasion! I would never dream of denying that you did all you possibly could. I have asserted and assert now, that the *limits* of what is "possible" for you to do are restricted by the narrowness of your outlook. It is ridiculous to talk about a "militant organisation" fighting for "immediate political demands," or conducting "the economic struggle against the employers and the government."

But if the reader wishes to see the pearls of Economist primitive methods, he must, of course, turn from the eclectic and vacillating *Rabocheye Dyelo* to the consistent and determined *Rabochaya Mysl.* In its Special Supplement, p. 13, R. M. wrote:

> Now two words about the so-called revolutionary intelligentsia proper. It is true that on more than one occasion it proved that it was quite prepared to "enter into determined battle with tsarism!" The unfortunate thing, however, is, that, ruthlessly persecuted by the political police, our revolutionary

* The interjections in brackets are Lenin's running comment on *Rabocheye Dyelo's* reply to *Iskra.—Ed.*

intelligentsia imagined that the battle with this political police was a political struggle with the autocracy. That is why, to this day, it cannot understand "where the forces for the fight against the autocracy are to be obtained."

What matchless and magnificent contempt for the struggle with the police the worshippers (in the worst sense of the word) of the *spontaneous* movement display, do they not? They are prepared to *justify* our inability to organise secretly by the argument that with the spontaneous growth of the mass movement, it is not at all important for us to fight against the political police!! Not many are prepared to subscribe to this monstrous conclusion; our defects in revolutionary organisation has become too urgent a matter to permit them to do that. Martynov, for example, would also refuse to subscribe to this, but in his case it is only because he is unable, or lacks the courage, to think out his ideas to their logical conclusion. Indeed, does the "task" of prompting the masses to put forward concrete demands promising palpable results call for special efforts to create a stable, centralised, militant, organisation of revolutionists? Cannot such a "task" be carried out even by masses who do not "fight at all against the political police"? Moreover, can this task be fulfilled unless, in addition to the few leaders, it is undertaken by the workers (the overwhelming majority), who in fact are *incapable* of "fighting against the political police"? Such workers, average people of the masses, are capable of displaying enormous energy and self-sacrifice in strikes and in street battles, with the police and troops, and are capable (in fact, are alone capable) of *determining* the whole outcome of our movement—but the struggle against the *political* police requires special qualities; it can be conducted only by *professional* revolutionists. And we must not only see to it that the masses "advance" concrete demands, but also that the masses of the workers "advance" an increasing number of such professional revolutionists from their own ranks. Thus we have reached the question of the relation between an organisation of professional revolutionists and the pure and simple labour movement. Although this question has found little reflection in literature, it has greatly engaged us "politicians," in conversations and controversies with those comrades who gravitate more or less towards Economism. It is a question that deserves special treatment. But before taking it up we shall deal with one

other quotation in order to illustrate the position we hold in regard to the connection between primitiveness and Economism.

In his *Reply*, N. N. wrote: "The Emancipation of Labour group demands direct struggle against the government without first considering where the material forces for this struggle are to be obtained, and without indicating '*the path of the struggle.*'" Emphasising the last words, the author adds the following footnote to the word "path": "This cannot be explained by the conspiratorial aims pursued, because the programme does not refer to secret plotting but to a *mass movement.* The masses cannot proceed by secret paths. Can we conceive of a secret strike? Can we conceive of secret demonstrations and petitions?" [*Vademecum*, p. 59.] Thus, the author approaches quite close to the question of the "material forces" (organisers of strikes and demonstrations) and to the "paths" of the struggle, but nevertheless, is still in a state of consternation, because he "worships" the mass movement, *i. e.*, he regards it as something that *relieves* us of the necessity for carrying on revolutionary activity and not as something that should embolden us and *stimulate* our revolutionary activity. Secret strikes are impossible —for those who take a direct and immediate part in them, but a strike may remain (and in the majority of cases does remain) a "secret" to the masses of the Russian workers, because the government takes care to cut all communication between strikers, takes care to prevent all news of strikes from spreading. Now here indeed is a special "struggle against the political police" required, a struggle that can never be conducted by such large masses as usually take part in strikes. Such a struggle must be organised, according to "all the rules of the art," by people who are professionally engaged in revolutionary activity. The fact that the masses are spontaneously entering the movement does not make the organisation of this struggle *less necessary.* On the contrary, it makes it *more necessary;* for we Socialists would be failing in our duty to the masses if we did not prevent the police from making a secret of (and if we did not ourselves sometimes secretly prepare) every strike and every demonstration. *And we will succeed in doing this,* precisely because the spontaneously awakening masses will *also advance from their own ranks* increasing numbers of "professional revolutionists" (that is, if we are not so foolish as to advise the workers to keep on marking time).

C. Organisation of Workers, and Organisation of Revolutionists

It is only natural that a Social-Democrat who conceives the political struggle as being identical with the "economic struggle against the employers and the government," should conceive "organisation of revolutionists" as being more or less identical with "organisation of workers." And this, in fact, is what actually happens; so that when we talk about organisation, we literally talk in different tongues. I recall a conversation I once had with a fairly consistent Economist, with whom I had not been previously acquainted.[217] We were discussing the brochure *Who Will Make the Political Revolution?* and we were very soon agreed that the principal defect in that brochure was that it ignored the question of organisation. We were beginning to think that we were in complete agreement with each other—but as the conversation proceeded, it became clear that we were talking of different things. My interlocutor accused the author of the brochure just mentioned of ignoring strike funds, mutual-aid societies, etc.; whereas I had in mind an organisation of revolutionists, as an essential factor in "making" the political revolution. After that became clear, I hardly remember a single question of importance upon which I was in agreement with that Economist!

What was the source of our disagreement? It is the fact that on questions of organisation and politics the Economists are forever lapsing from Social-Democracy into trade unionism. The political struggle carried on by the Social-Democrats is far more extensive and complex than the economic struggle the workers carry on against the employers and the government. Similarly (and indeed for that reason), the organisation of revolutionary Social-Democrats must inevitably *differ* from the organisations of the workers designed for the latter struggle. The workers' organisations must in the first place be trade organisations; secondly, they must be as wide as possible; and thirdly, they must be as public as conditions will allow (here, of course, I have only autocratic Russia in mind). On the other hand, the organisations of revolutionists must be comprised first and foremost of people whose profession is that of revolutionists (that is why I speak of organisations of *revolutionists,* meaning revolutionary Social-Democrats). As this is the common feature of the members of such an organisation, *all dis-*

tinctions as between workers and intellectuals, and certainly distinctions of trade and profession, must be dropped. Such an organisation must of necessity be not too extensive and as secret as possible. Let us examine this three-fold distinction.

In countries where political liberty exists the distinction between a labour union and a political organisation is clear, as is the distinction between trade unions and Social-Democracy. The relation of the latter to the former will naturally vary in each country according to historical, legal and other conditions—it may be more or less close or more or less complex (in our opinion it should be as close and simple as possible); but trade-union organisations are certainly not in the least identical with the Social-Democratic party organisations in those countries. In Russia, however, the yoke of autocracy appears at first glance to obliterate all distinctions between a Social-Democratic organisation and trade unions, because *all* trade unions and *all* circles are prohibited, and because the principal manifestation and weapon of the workers' economic struggle—the strike—is regarded as a crime (and sometimes even as a political crime!). Conditions in our country, therefore, strongly "impel" the workers who are conducting the economic struggle to concern themselves with political questions. They also "impel" the Social-Democrats to confuse trade unionism with Social-Democracy (and our Krichevskys, Martynovs and their like, while speaking enthusiastically of the first kind of "impelling," fail to observe the "impelling" of the second kind). Indeed, picture to yourselves the people who are immersed ninety-nine per cent in "the economic struggle against the employers and the government." Some of them never, *during the whole course of their activity* (four to six months), thought of the necessity for a more complex organisation of revolutionists; others, perhaps, come across the fairly widely distributed revisionist literature, from which they convince themselves of the profound importance of "the drab daily struggle." Still others will be carried away, perhaps, by the seductive idea of showing the world a new example of "close and organic contact with the proletarian struggle"—contact between the trade-union and Social-Democratic movements. Such people would perhaps argue that the later a country enters into the arena of capitalism, the more the Socialists in that country may take part in and support the trade-union movement, and the less reason is there for non-Social-Democratic trade unions. So far, the argument is absolutely correct;

unfortunately, however, some go beyond that and hint at the complete fusion of Social-Democracy with trade unionism. We shall soon see, from the example of the statutes of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle, what a harmful effect this has upon our plans of organisation.

The workers' organisations for carrying on the economic struggle should be trade-union organisations; every Social-Democratic worker should, as far as possible, support and actively work inside these organisations. That is true. But it would be far from being to our interest to demand that only Social-Democrats be eligible for membership in the trade unions. The only effect of this, if it were attempted, would be to restrict our influence over the masses. Let every worker who understands the necessity for organisation, in order to carry on the struggle against the employers and the government, join the trade unions. The very objects of the trade unions would be unattainable unless they united all who have attained at least this elementary level of understanding, and unless they were extremely wide organisations. The wider these organisations are, the wider our influence over them will be. They will then be influenced not only by the "spontaneous" development of the economic struggle, but also by the direct and conscious action of the Socialists on their comrades in the unions. But a wide organisation cannot be a strictly secret organisation (since the latter demands far greater training than is required for the economic struggle). How is the contradiction between the necessity for a large membership and the necessity for strictly secret methods to be reconciled? How are we to make the trade unions as public as possible? Generally speaking, there are perhaps only two ways to this end: Either the trade unions become legalised (which in some countries precedes the legalisation of the Socialist and political unions), or the organisation is kept a secret one, but so "free" and "loose" that the need for secret methods become almost negligible as far as the mass of the members are concerned.

The legalisation of the non-Socialist and non-political labour unions in Russia has already begun, and there is no doubt that every advance our rapidly growing Social-Democratic working-class movement makes will increase and encourage the attempts at legalisation. These attempts proceed for the most part from supporters of the existing order, but they will proceed also from the workers themselves and from the liberal intellectuals. The banner of legality

has already been unfurled by the Vassilyevs and the Zubatovs. Support has been promised by the Ozerovs and the Wormses; and followers of the new tendency are to be found even among the workers. Henceforth, we must reckon with this tendency. How are we to reckon with it? About this there can be no two opinions among Social-Democrats. We must constantly expose any part played in this movement by the Zubatovs and the Vassilyevs, the gendarmes and the priests, and explain to the workers what their intentions are. We must also expose the conciliatory, "harmonious" undertones that will be heard in the speeches delivered by liberal politicians at the legal meetings of the workers, irrespective of whether they proceed from an earnest conviction as to the desirability of the peaceful co-operation of the classes, whether they proceed from a desire to curry favour with the employers, or are simply the result of not being able to do otherwise. We must also warn the workers against the traps often set by the police, who at such open meetings and permitted societies spy out the "hotheads," and who, through the medium of the legal organisations, endeavour to plant their agent-provocateurs in the illegal organisations.

But while doing all this, we must not forget that *in the long run*, the legalisation of the working class movement will be to our advantage, and not to the Zubatovs. On the contrary, our campaign of exposure will help to separate the tares from the wheat. What the tares are, we have already indicated. By the wheat we mean, attracting the attention of increasing numbers of the more backward sections of the workers to social and political questions, and to freeing ourselves, the revolutionists, from functions which are essentially legal (the distribution of legal books, mutual aid, etc.), the development of which will inevitably provide us with an increasing quantity of material for agitation. Looked at from this point of view, we may say, and we should say to the Zubatovs and the Ozerovs, "Keep at it, gentlemen, do your best!" We shall expose your efforts to place a trap in the path of the workers (either by way of direct provocation, or by the "honest" corruption of the workers with the aid of Struvism), but we shall be grateful for every real step forward even if it is timid and vacillating; we shall say: Please continue! A real step forward can only result in a real, if small, extension of the workers' field of action. And every such extension must be to our advantage and help to hasten the advent of legal societies, not of the kind in which agents-pro

vocateurs hunt for Socialists, but of the kind in which Socialists will hunt for adherents. In a word, our task is to fight down the tares. It is not our business to grow wheat in flower-pots. By pulling up the tares, we clear the soil for the wheat. And while the old-fashioned folk are tending their flower-pot crops, we must prepare reapers, not only to cut down the tares of to-day, but also to reap the wheat of to-morrow.*

Legalisation, therefore, will *not solve* the problem of creating a trade-union organisation that will be as public and as extensive as possible (but we would be extremely glad if the Zubatovs and the Ozerovs provided even a partial opportunity for such a solution—to which end we must fight them as strenuously as possible!). There only remains the path of secret trade-union organisation; and *we must* offer every possible assistance to the workers, who (as we definitely know) have already adopted this path. Trade-union organisations may not only be of tremendous value in developing and consolidating the economic struggle, but may also become a very useful auxiliary to the political, agitational and revolutionary organisations.

In order to achieve this purpose, and in order to guide the nascent trade-union movement in the direction the Social-Democrats desire, we must first fully understand the foolishness of the plan of organisation with which the St. Petersburg Economists have been occupying themselves for nearly five years. That plan is described in the Rules of a Workers' Fund, of July, 1897 [*Listok Rabochevo*, Nos. 9 and 10, p. 46, in *Rabochaya Mysl*, No. 1], and also in the Rules for a Trade Union Workers' Organisation, of October, 1900 [special leaflet printed in St. Petersburg and quoted in *Iskra*, No. 1]. The fundamental error contained in both these sets of rules is that they give a detailed formulation of a wide workers' organisation and confuse the latter with the organisation of revolutionists. Let

* *Iskra's* campaign against the tares evoked the following angry outbreak on the part of *Rabocheye Dyelo:* "For *Iskra*, the signs of the times lie not in the great events of the spring, but in the miserable attempts of the agents of Zubatov to 'legalise' the working-class movement. It fails to see that these facts tell against it and prove that the working-class movement is assuming menacing proportions in the eyes of the government." [*Two Congresses*, p. 27.] For this we have to blame the "dogmatism" of the orthodox Marxists who ignore the imperative demands of life. They obstinately refuse to see the yard-high wheat and are fighting down the inch-high tares! Does this not reveal a "distorted sense of perspective in regard to the Russian working-class movement"? [*ibid.*, p. 27.]

us take the last-mentioned set of rules, since it is drawn up in greater detail. The body of it consists of *fifty-two* paragraphs. Twenty-three paragraphs deal with structure, the method of conducting business, and the competence of the "workers' circles," which are to be organised in every factory ("not more than ten persons") and which elect "central (factory) groups." "The central group," says paragraph 2, "observes all that goes on in its factory or workshop and keeps a record of events. . . ." "The central group presents to the contributors a monthly report on the state of the funds" (Par. 17), etc. Ten paragraphs are devoted to the "district organisation" and nineteen, to the highly complex connection between the Committee of the Workers' Organisation and the Committee of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle (elected by each district and by the "executive groups"—"groups of propagandists for maintaining contact with the provinces and with exiles abroad, and for managing stores, publications and funds").

Social-Democracy="executive groups" connected with the economic struggle of the workers! It would be difficult to find a more striking illustration than this of how far the Economists' ideas deviate from Social-Democracy on the question of trade unionism, and how foreign to them is the idea that a Social-Democrat must concern himself first and foremost with an organisation of revolutionists, capable of guiding the *whole* proletarian struggle for emancipation. To talk of "the political emancipation of the working class" and the struggle against "tsarist despotism," and at the same time to write statutes like these, indicates a complete failure to understand what the real political tasks of the Social-Democrats are. Not one of the fifty or so paragraphs reveals the slightest glimmer of understanding that it is necessary to conduct the widest possible political agitation among the masses, an agitation that deals with every phase of Russian absolutism, and with every aspect of the various social classes in Russia. Rules like these are of no use even for the achievement of trade union aims, quite apart from political aims, for that requires organisation *according to trade,* and yet the rules do not contain a single reference to this.

But most characteristic of all, perhaps, is the amazing top-heaviness of the whole "system," which attempts to unite every factory with the "committee" by a long string of uniform and ludicrously petty rules and a three-stage system of election. Hemmed in by the narrow outlook of Economism, the mind is lost in details which

positively reek of red tape and bureaucracy. In practice, of course, three-fourths of the clauses are impossible of application; moreover, a "conspiratorial" organisation of this kind, with its central group in each factory, will render the work of the gendarmes extraordinarily easy. Our Polish comrades have already passed through a similar phase in their own movement, when everybody was extremely enthusiastic about the extensive organisation of workers' funds; but these ideas were very quickly abandoned when it was found that the funds only provided rich harvests for the gendarmes. If we are out for wide workers' organisations, and not for wide arrests, if it is not our purpose to provide satisfaction to the gendarmes, these organisations must remain absolutely loose and not bound by any strict rules. . . . But will they be able to function? Well, let us see what the functions are: ". . . To observe all that goes on in the factory and keep a record of events" (Par. 2 of the Rules). Must that really be formulated in a set of rules? Could not the purpose be better served by correspondence conducted in the illegal papers and without setting up special groups? ". . . To lead the struggles of the workers for the improvement of their workshop conditions" (Par. 3 of the Rules). This, too, need not be strictly formulated. Any agitator with any intelligence at all can gather what the demands of the workers are in the course of ordinary conversation and transmit them to a narrow—not a wide—organisation of revolutionists to be embodied in a leaflet; ". . . To organise a fund . . . to which contributions of two kopecks per ruble * should be made (Par. 9) . . . to present monthly reports to the contributors on the state of the funds (Par. 17) . . . to expel members who fail to pay their contributions (Par. 10), and so forth. Why, this is a very paradise for the police; for nothing would be easier than for them to penetrate into the ponderous secrecy of a "central factory fund," confiscate the money and arrest the best members. Would it not be simpler to issue one-kopeck or two-kopeck coupons bearing the official stamp of a well-known (very exclusive and secret) organisation, or to make collections without coupons of any kind and to print reports in a certain agreed code in the legal paper? The object would thereby be attained, but it would be a hundred times more difficult for the gendarmes to pick up clues.

* Of wages earned.—*Ed.*

I could go on analysing the rules, but I think that what has been said will suffice. A small, compact core, consisting of reliable, experienced and hardened workers, with responsible agents in the principal districts and connected by all the rules of strict secrecy with the organisations of revolutionists, can, with the wide support of the masses and without an elaborate set of rules, perform *all* the functions of a trade-union organisation, and perform them, moreover, in the manner Social-Democrats desire. Only in this way can we secure the *consolidation* and development of a *Social-Democratic* trade-union movement, in spite of the gendarmes.

It may be objected that an organisation which is so loose that it is not even formulated, and which even has no enrolled and registered members, cannot be called an organisation at all. That may very well be. I am not out for names. But this "organisation without members" can do everything that is required, and will, from the very outset, guarantee the closest contact between our future trade unionists and Socialism. Only an incorrigible utopian would want a *wide* organisation of workers, with elections, reports, universal suffrage, etc., under autocracy.

The moral to be drawn from this is a simple one. If we begin with the solid foundation of a strong organisation of revolutionists, we can guarantee the stability of the movement as a whole, and carry out the aims of both Social-Democracy and of trade unionism. If, however, we begin with a wide workers' organisation, supposed to be most "accessible" to the masses, when as a matter of fact it will be most accessible to the gendarmes, and will make the revolutionists most accessible to the police, we shall neither achieve the aims of Social-Democracy nor of trade unionism; we shall not escape from our primitiveness, and because we constantly remain scattered and dispersed, we shall make only the trade unions of the Zubatov and Ozerov type most accessible to the masses.

What should be the functions of the organisation of revolutionists? We shall deal with this in detail. But first let us examine a very typical argument advanced by the terrorist, who (sad fate!) in this matter also is in the same boat as the Economist. *Svoboda*—a journal published especially for working men—in its first number, contains an article entitled "Organisation," the author of which tries to defend his friends the Economist workers of Ivanovo-Voznesensk. He writes:

It is a bad thing when the crowd is mute and unenlightened, and when the movement does not proceed from the rank and file. For instance, the students of a university town leave for their homes during the summer and other vacations and immediately the movement comes to a standstill. Can such a workers' movement which has to be pushed on from outside be a real force? Of course not! It has not yet learned to walk, it is still in leading strings. So it is everywhere. The students go off, and everything comes to a standstill. As soon as the cream is skimmed—the milk turns sour. If the "committee" is arrested, everything comes to a standstill until a new one can be formed. And, one never knows what sort of a committee will be set up next —it may be nothing like the former one. The first preached one thing, the second may preach the very opposite. The continuity between yesterday and to-morrow is broken, the experience of the past does not enlighten the future. And all this is because no deep roots have been struck, roots in the crowd; because, instead of having a hundred fools at work, we have ten wise men. Ten wise men can be caught up at a snap; but when the organisation embraces the crowd, everything will proceed from the crowd, and nobody, however zealous, can stop the cause [p. 63].

The facts are described correctly. The above quotation presents a fairly good picture of our primitive methods. But the conclusions drawn from it are worthy of the *Rabochaya Mysl,* both for their stupidity and their political tactlessness. They represent the height of stupidity, because the author confused the philosophical and social-historical question of the "depth" of the "roots" of the movement with the technical and organisational question of the best method of fighting the gendarmes. They represent the height of political tactlessness, because the author, instead of appealing from the bad leaders to the good leaders, appeals from the leaders in general to the "crowd." This is as much an attempt to drag the movement back organisationally, as the idea of substituting political agitation by excitative terrorism is an attempt to drag it back politically.

Indeed, I am experiencing a veritable *embarras de richesses,* and hardly know where to begin to disentangle the confusion *Svoboda* has introduced in this subject. For the sake of clarity, we shall begin by quoting an example. Take the Germans. It will not be denied, I hope, that the German organisations embrace the crowd, that in Germany everything proceeds from the crowd, that the working-class movement there has learned to walk. Yet, observe how this vast crowd of millions values its "dozen" tried political leaders, how firmly it clings to them! Members of the hostile parties in parliament often tease the Socialists by exclaiming: "Fine democrats you are indeed! Your movement is a working-class movement only in name; as a matter of fact it is the same clique of

leaders that is always in evidence; Bebel and Liebknecht, year in and year out, and that goes on for decades. Your deputies are supposed to be elected from among the workers, but they are more permanent than the officials appointed by the Emperor!" But the Germans only smile with contempt at these demagogic attempts to set the "crowd" against the "leaders," to arouse turbid and vain instincts in the former, and to rob the movement of its solidity and stability by undermining the confidence of the masses in their "dozen of wise men." The political ideas of the Germans have already developed sufficiently, and they have acquired enough political experience to enable them to understand that without the "dozen" of tried and talented leaders (and talented men are not born by hundreds), professionally trained, schooled by long experience and working in perfect harmony, no class in modern society is capable of conducting a determined struggle. Numerous demagogues in Germany have flattered the "hundred fools," exalted them above the "dozen of wise men," extolled the "mighty fists" of the masses, and (like Most and Hasselmann) have spurred them on to reckless "revolutionary" action and sown distrust towards the tried and trusted leaders. It was only by stubbornly and bitterly combating every symptom of demagogy within the Socialist movement that German Socialism managed to grow and become as strong as it is. Our wiseacres, however, at the very moment when Russian Social-Democracy is passing through a crisis entirely due to our lack of a sufficient number of trained, developed and experienced leaders to guide the spontaneous ferment of the masses, cry out with the profundity of fools, "it is a bad business when the movement does not proceed from the rank and file."

"A committee of students is no good, it is not stable." Quite true. But the conclusion that should be drawn from this is that we must have a committee of professional *revolutionists* and it does not matter whether a student or a worker is capable of qualifying himself as a professional revolutionist. The conclusion you draw, however, is that the working-class movement must not be pushed on from outside! In your political innocence you fail to observe that you are playing into the hands of our Economists and furthering our primitiveness. I would like to ask, what is meant by the students "pushing on" the workers? *All* it means is that the students bring to the worker the fragments of political knowledge they possess, the crumbs of Socialist ideas they have managed to

acquire (for the principal intellectual diet of the present-day student, legal Marxism, can furnish only the A. B. C., only the crumbs of knowledge). *Such* "pushing on from outside" can never be too excessive; on the contrary, so far there has been too little, all too little of it in our movement; we have been stewing in our own juice far too long; we have bowed far too slavishly before the spontaneous "economic struggle of the workers against the employers and the government." We professional revolutionists must continue, and will continue, *this kind* of "pushing," and a hundred times more forcibly than we have done hitherto. The very fact that you select so despicable a phrase as "pushing on from outside"—a phrase which cannot but rouse in the workers (at least in the workers who are as ignorant as you are yourselves) a sense of distrust towards *all* who bring them political knowledge and revolutionary experience from outside, and rouse in them an instinctive hostility to such people—proves that you are *demagogues*—and a demagogue is the worst enemy of the working class.

Oh! Don't start howling about my "uncomradely methods" of controversy. I have not the least intention of casting aspersions upon the purity of your intentions. As I have already said, one may be a demagogue out of sheer political innocence. But I have shown that you have descended to demagogy, and I shall never tire of repeating that demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class. They are the worst enemies of the working class because they arouse bad instincts in the crowd, because the ignorant worker is unable to recognise his enemies in men who represent themselves, and sometimes sincerely represent themselves, to be his friends. They are the worst enemies of the working class, because in this period of doubt and hesitation, when our movement is only just beginning to take shape, nothing is easier than to employ demagogic methods to side-track the crowd, which can realise its mistake only by bitter experience. That is why Russian Social-Democrats at the present time must declare determined opposition to *Svoboda* and the *Rabocheye Dyelo* which have sunk to the level of demagogy. We shall return to this subject again.*

* For the moment we shall observe merely that our remarks on "pushing on from outside" and the other views on organisation expressed by *Svoboda* apply equally to *all* the Economists including the adherents of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, for they have either themselves preached and defended such views on organisation, or have allowed themselves to be led astray by them.

"A dozen wise men can be more easily caught than a hundred fools!" This wonderful truth (which the hundred fools will applaud) appears obvious only because in the very midst of the argument you have skipped from one question to another. You began by talking, and continued to talk, of catching a "committee," of catching an "organisation," and now you skip to the question of getting hold of the "roots" of the movement in the "depths." The fact is, of course, that our movement cannot be caught precisely because it has hundreds and hundreds of thousands of roots deep down among the masses, but that is not the point we are discussing. As far as "roots in the depths" are concerned, we cannot be "caught" even now, in spite of all our primitiveness; but, we all complain, and cannot but complain, of the ease with which the *organisations* can be caught, with the result that it is impossible to maintain continuity in the movement. If you agree to discuss the question of catching the *organisations*, and to stick to that question, then I assert that it is far more difficult to catch ten wise men than it is to catch a hundred fools. And this premise I shall defend no matter how much you instigate the crowd against me for my "anti-democratic" views, etc. As I have already said, by "wise men," in connection with organisation, I mean *professional revolutionists*, irrespective of whether they are students or workingmen. I assert: 1. That no movement can be durable without a stable organisation of leaders to maintain continuity; 2. that the more widely the masses are drawn into the struggle and form the basis of the movement, the more necessary is it to have such an organisation and the more stable must it be (for it is much easier then for demagogues to side-track the more backward sections of the masses); 3. that the organisation must consist chiefly of persons engaged in revolution as a profession; 4. that in a country with a despotic government, the more we *restrict* the membership of this organisation to persons who are engaged in revolution as a profession and who have been professionally trained in the art of combating the political police, the more difficult will it be to catch the organisation; and 5. the *wider* will be the circle of men and women of the working class or of other classes of society able to join the movement and perform active work in it.

I invite our Economists, terrorists and "Economists-terrorists" *

* This latter term is perhaps more applicable to *Svoboda* than the former, for in an article entitled "The Regeneration of Revolutionism" it defends

to confute these premises. At the moment, I shall deal only with the last two points. The question as to whether it is easier to catch "a dozen wise men" or "a hundred fools," in the last analysis, amounts to the question we have considered above, namely, whether it is possible to have a mass *organisation* when the maintenance of strict secrecy is essential. We can never give a mass organisation that degree of secrecy which is essential for the persistent and continuous struggle against the government. But to concentrate all secret functions in the hands of as small a number of professional revolutionists as possible, does not mean that the latter will "do the thinking for all" and that the crowd will not take an active part in the movement. On the contrary, the crowd will advance from its ranks increasing numbers of professional revolutionists, for it will know that it is not enough for a few students and workingmen waging economic war to gather together and form a "committee," but that professional revolutionists must be trained for years; the crowd will "think" not of primitive ways but of training professional revolutionists. The centralisation of the secret functions of the *organisation* does not mean the concentration of all the functions of the *movement.* The active participation of the greatest masses in the dissemination of illegal literature will not diminish because a dozen professional revolutionists concentrate in their hands the secret part of the work; on the contrary, it will *increase tenfold.* Only in this way will the reading of illegal literature, the contribution to illegal literature, and to some extent even the distribution of illegal literature *almost cease to be secret work,* for the police will soon come to realise the folly and futility of setting the whole judicial and administrative machine into motion to intercept every copy of a publication that is being broadcast in thousands. This applies not only to the press, but to every function of the movement, even to demonstrations. The active and wide-

terrorism, while in the article at present under review it defends Economism. One might say of *Svoboda* that—"It would if it could, but it can't." Its wishes and intentions are excellent—but the result is utter confusion; and this is chiefly due to the fact that while *Svoboda* advocates continuity of organisation, it refuses to recognise the continuity of revolutionary thought and of Social-Democratic theory. It wants to revive the professional revolutionist ("The Regeneration of Revolutionism"), and to that end proposes, firstly, excitative terrorism, and secondly, "The organisation of the average worker," because he will be less likely to be "pushed on from outside." In other words, it proposes to pull the house down to use the timbers for warming it.

spread participation of the masses will not suffer; on the contrary, it will benefit by the fact that a "dozen" experienced revolutionists, no less professionally trained than the police, will concentrate all the secret side of the work in their hands—prepare leaflets, work out approximate plans and appoint bodies of leaders for each town district, for each factory district, and for each educational institution (I know that exception will be taken to my "undemocratic" views, but I shall reply to this altogether unintelligent objection later on). The centralisation of the more secret functions in an organisation of revolutionists will not diminish, but rather increase the extent and the quality of the activity of a large number of other organisations intended for wide membership and which, therefore, can be as loose and as public as possible, for example, trade unions, workers' circles for self-education, and the reading of illegal literature, and Socialist, and also democratic, circles for *all other sections of the population,* etc., etc. We must have *as large a number as possible* of such organisations having the widest possible variety of functions, but it is absurd and dangerous to *confuse these with organisations of revolutionists,* to erase the line of demarcation between them, to dim still more the already incredibly hazy appreciation by the masses that to "serve" the mass movement we must have people who will devote themselves exclusively to Social-Democratic activities, and that such people must *train* themselves patiently and steadfastly to be professional revolutionists.

Aye, this consciousness has become incredibly dim. The most grievous sin we have committed in regard to organisation is that *by our primitiveness we have lowered the prestige of revolutionists in Russia.* A man who is weak and vacillating on theoretical questions, who has a narrow outlook, who makes excuses for his own slackness on the ground that the masses are awakening spontaneously, who resembles a trade-union secretary more than a people's tribune, who is unable to conceive a broad and bold plan, who is incapable of inspiring even his enemies with respect for himself, and who is inexperienced and clumsy in his own professional art—the art of combating the political police—such a man is not a revolutionist but a hopeless amateur!

Let no active worker take offence at these frank remarks, for as far as insufficient training is concerned, I apply them first and foremost to myself. I used to work in a circle [218] that set itself a great and all-embracing task: and every member of that circle suf-

fered to the point of torture from the realisation that we were proving ourselves to be amateurs at a moment in history when we might have been able to say—paraphrasing a well-known epigram: "Give us an organisation of revolutionists, and we shall overturn the whole of Russia!" And the more I recall the burning sense of shame I then experienced, the more bitter are my feelings towards those pseudo-Social-Democrats whose teachings bring disgrace on the calling of a revolutionist, who fail to understand that our task is not to degrade the revolutionist to the level of an amateur, but to *exalt* the amateur to the level of a revolutionist.

D. The Scope of Organisational Work

We have already heard from B-v about "the lack of revolutionary forces fit for action which is felt not only in St. Petersburg, but over the whole of Russia." No one, we suppose, will dispute this fact. But the question is, how is it to be explained? B-v writes:

> We shall not enter in detail into the historical causes of this phenomenon; we shall state merely that a society demoralised by prolonged political reaction and split by past and present economic changes, advances from its own ranks *an extremely small number of persons fit for revolutionary work;* that the working class does of course advance from its own ranks revolutionary workers who to some extent pass into the ranks of the illegal organisations, but the number of such revolutionists are inadequate to meet the requirements of the times. This is more particularly the case because the workers engaged for eleven and a half hours a day in the factory may perhaps be able to fulfil mainly the functions of an agitator; but propaganda and organisation, delivery and reproduction of illegal literature, issuing leaflets, etc., are duties which must necessarily fall mainly upon the shoulders of an extremely small intelligent force. [*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 6, pp. 38-39.]

There are many points in the above upon which we disagree with B-v, particularly with those points we have emphasised, and which most strikingly reveal that, although suffering (as every practical worker who thinks over the position would be) from our primitive methods, B-v cannot, because he is so ground down by Economism, find the way out of this intolerable situation. It is not true to say that society advances from its ranks few persons fit for "work." It advances *very many* but we are unable to make use of them all. The critical, transitional state of our movement in this connection may be formulated as follows: *There are no people—yet there are enormous numbers of people.* There are enormous numbers of people, because the working class and the most diverse strata of

society, year after year, advance from their ranks an increasing number of discontented people who desire to protest, who are ready to render effective aid in the fight against absolutism, the intolerableness of which is not yet recognised by all, but is nevertheless more and more acutely sensed by increasing masses of the people. At the same time we have no people, because we have no political leaders, we have no talented organisers capable of organising extensive and at the same time uniform and harmonious work that would give employment to all forces, even the most inconsiderable. "The growth and development of revolutionary organisations" not only lag behind the growth of the labour movement, which even B-v admits, but also behind the general democratic movement among all strata of the people (in passing, probably B-v would now admit this supplement to his conclusion). The scope of revolutionary work is too narrow compared with the breadth of the spontaneous basis of the movement. It is too hemmed in by the wretched theory about the "economic struggle against the employers and the government." And yet, at the present time, not only Social-Democratic political agitators, but also Social-Democratic organisers must "go among all classes of the population." *

There is hardly a single practical worker, we think, who would have any doubt about the ability of Social-Democrats to distribute the thousand-and-one minute functions of their organisational work among the various representatives of the most varied classes. Lack of specialisation is one of our most serious technical defects, about which B-v justly and bitterly complains. The smaller each separate "operation" in our common cause will be, the more people we shall find capable of carrying out such operations (who, in the majority of cases, are not capable of becoming professional revolutionists), the more difficult will it be for the police to "catch" all these "detail workers," and the more difficult will it be for them to frame up, out of an arrest for some petty affair, a "case" that would justify the government's expenditure on the "secret service." As for the number ready to help us, we have already in the previous chapter referred to the gigantic change that has taken place in this respect

* For example, in military circles an undoubted revival of the democratic spirit has recently been observed, partly as a consequence of the frequent street fights that now take place against "enemies" like workers and students. And as soon as our available forces permit, we must without fail devote serious attention to propaganda and agitation among soldiers and officers, and to creating "military organisations" affiliated to our party.

in the last five years or so. On the other hand, in order to unite all these tiny fractions into one whole, in order to avoid breaking the movement up into fragments, in breaking up functions, and in order to imbue those who carry out these minute functions with the conviction of the necessity for and importance of their work, without which they will never do the work,* it is necessary to have an organisation of tried revolutionists. If we had such an organisation, the more secret it would be, the stronger and more widespread would be the confidence of the masses in the party, and, as we know, in time of war, it is not only of great importance to imbue one's own adherents with confidence in the strength of one's army, but also the enemy and all *neutral* elements; friendly neutrality may sometimes decide the outcome of the battle. If such an organisation existed on a firm theoretical basis, and possessed a Social-Democratic journal, we would have no reason to fear that the movement will be diverted from its path by the numerous "outside" elements that will be attracted to it. (On the contrary, it is precisely at the present time, when primitive methods prevail among us, that many Social-Democrats are observed to gravitate towards the *Credo*, imagining that they alone are Social-Democrats.) In a word, specialisation necessarily presupposes centralisation, and in its turn imperatively calls for it.

But B-v himself, who has so excellently described the necessity for specialisation, underestimates its importance, in our opinion, in the second part of the argument that we have quoted. The number

* I recall the story a comrade related to me of a factory inspector, who, desiring to help, and in fact did help, Social-Democracy, bitterly complained that he did not know whether the "information" he sent reached the proper revolutionary quarter; he did not know how much his help was really required, and what possibilities there were for utilising his small services. Every practical worker, of course, knows of more than one case similar to this, of our primitiveness depriving us of allies. And these services, each "small" in itself, but incalculable taken together, could be rendered to us by office employees and officials, not only in factories, but in the postal service, on the railways, in the Customs, among the nobility, among the clergy, and *every other* walk of life, including even the police service and the Court! Had we a real party, a real militant organisation of revolutionists, we would not put the question bluntly to every one of these "abettors," we would not hasten in every single case to bring them right into the very heart of our "illegality," but, on the contrary, we would husband them very carefully and would train people especially for such functions, bearing in mind that many students could be of much greater service to the party as "abettors" —officials—than as "short-term" revolutionists. But, I repeat, only an organisation that is already firmly established and has no lack of active forces would have the right to apply such tactics.

of working-class revolutionists is inadequate, he says. This is absolutely true, and once again we emphasise that the "valuable communication of a close observer" fully confirms our view of the causes of the present crisis in Social-Democracy, and, consequently, confirms our view of the means for removing these causes. Not only revolutionists, in general, but even working-class revolutionists lag behind the spontaneous awakening of the working masses. And this *fact* most strikingly confirms, even from the "practical" point-of-view, not only the absurdity but even the *political reactionariness* of the "pedagogics" to which we are so often treated when discussing our duties to the workers. This fact proves that our very first and most imperative duty is to help to train working-class revolutionists who will be on the same level *in regard to party activity* as intellectual revolutionists (we emphasise the words "in regard to party activity," because although it is necessary, it is not so easy and not so imperative to bring the workers up to the level of intellectuals in other respects). Therefore, attention must be devoted *principally* to the task of *raising* the workers to the level of revolutionists, but without, in doing so, necessarily *degrading* ourselves to the level of the "labour masses," as the Economists wish to do, or necessarily to the level of the average worker, as *Svoboda* desires to do (and by this, raises itself to the second grade of Economists "pedagogics"). I am far from denying the necessity for popular literature for the workers, and especially popular (but, of course, not vulgar) literature for the especially backward workers. But what annoys me is that pedagogics are confused with questions of politics and organisation. You, gentlemen, who talk so much about the "average worker," as a matter of fact, rather insult the workers by your desire to *talk down* to them, to stoop to them when discussing labour politics or labour organisation. Talk about serious things in a serious manner; leave pedagogics to the pedagogues, and not to politicians and to organisers! Are there not advanced people, "average people," and "masses," among the intelligentsia? Does not every one recognise that popular literature is required for the intelligentsia and is not such literature written? Just imagine some one, in an article on organising college or high-school students, repeating over and over again, as if he had made a new discovery, that first of all we must have an organisation of "average students." The author of such an article would rightly be laughed at. He will be told: Give us an organisation idea, if you

have one, and we ourselves will settle the question as to which of us are "average," as to who is higher and who is lower. But if you have no organisational ideas *of your own*, then all your chatter about "masses" and "average" is just simply boring. Try to understand that these questions about "politics" and "organisation" are so serious in themselves that they cannot be dealt with in any other but a serious way: We can and must *educate* workers (and university and high-school students) so as to enable them to understand us *when we speak to them* about these questions; and when you come to talk about these questions to us give us real replies to them, do not fall back on the "average," or on the "masses"; don't evade them by quoting adages or mere phrases.*

In order to be fully prepared for his task, the working-class revolutionist must also become a professional revolutionist. Hence B-v is wrong when he says that as the worker is engaged for 11½ hours a day in the factory, therefore the brunt of all the other revolutionary functions (apart from agitation) "*must necessarily* fall mainly upon the shoulders of an extremely small intellectual force." It need not "necessarily" be so. It is so because we are backward, because we do not recognise our duty to assist every capable worker to become a *professional* agitator, organiser, propagandist, literature distributor, etc., etc. In this respect, we waste our strength in a positively shameful manner; we lack the ability to husband that which requires to be so carefully tended in order that it may grow. Look at the Germans: they have a hundred times more forces than we have. But they understand perfectly well that the "average" does not too frequently promote really capable agitators, etc., from its ranks. Hence, immediately they get a capable workingman, they try to place him in such conditions as will enable him to develop and apply his abilities to the utmost: he is made a professional agitator, he is encouraged to widen the field of his activity, to spread it from one factory to the whole of his trade, from one locality to the whole country. He acquires experi-

* *Svoboda* No. 1, p. 66, articles on "Organisation": "The heavy tread of the army of labour will re-inforce all the demands that will be advanced by Russian Labour"—Labour with a capital L, of course. And this very author exclaims: "I am not in the least hostile towards the intelligentsia, but" [This is the very word *but* that Shchedrin translated as meaning: The ears never grow higher than the forehead!] "but I get frightfully annoyed when a man comes to me and eloquently appeals to be accepted for his [his?] beauty and virtues" [p. 62]. Yes. This "always frightfully annoys" me too.

ence and dexterity in his profession, his outlook becomes wider, his knowledge increases, he observes the prominent political leaders from other localities and other parties, he strives to rise to their level and combine within himself the knowledge of working-class environment and freshness of Socialist convictions with professional skill, without which the proletariat *cannot* carry on a stubborn struggle with the excellently trained enemy. Only in this way can men of the stamp of Bebel and Auer be promoted from the ranks of the working class. But what takes place very largely automatically in a politically free country, must in Russia be done deliberately and systematically by our organisations. A workingman who is at all talented and "promising," *must not be left* to work eleven hours a day in a factory. We must arrange that he be maintained by the party, that he may in due time go underground, that he change the place of his activity, otherwise he will not enlarge his experience, he will not widen his outlook, and will not be able to stay in the fight against the gendarmes for several years. As the spontaneous rise of the labouring masses becomes wider and deeper, it not only promotes from its ranks an increasing number of talented agitators, but also of talented organisers, propagandists, and "practical workers" in the best sense of the term (of whom there are so few among our intelligentsia). In the majority of cases, the latter are somewhat careless and sluggish in their habits (so characteristic of Russians). When we shall have detachments of specially trained working-class revolutionists who have gone through long years of preparation (and, of course, revolutionists "of all arms") no political police in the world will be able to contend against them, for these detachments will consist of men absolutely devoted and loyal to the revolution, and will themselves enjoy the absolute confidence and devotion of the broad masses of the workers. The *sin* we commit is that we do not sufficiently "stimulate" the workers to take this path, "common" to them and to the "intellectuals," of professional revolutionary training, and that we too frequently drag them back by our silly speeches about what "can be understood" by the masses of the workers, by the "average workers," etc.

In this, as in other cases, the narrowness of our field of organisational work is without a doubt inherently due (although the overwhelming majority of the Economists and the novices in practical work refuse to recognise it) to the fact that we restrict our theories and our political tasks to a narrow field. Subservience to spon-

taneity seems to inspire a fear to take even one step away from what "can be understood" by the masses, a fear to rise too high above mere subservience to the immediate requirements of the masses. Have no fear, gentlemen! Remember that we stand so low on the plane of organisation, that the very idea that we could rise *too high* is absurd!

E. "Conspirative" Organisation and "Democracy"

There are many people among us who are so sensitive to the "voice of life" that they fear that voice more than anything in the world, and accuse those, who adhere to the views here expounded, of Narodovolism,* of failing to understand "democracy," etc. We must deal with these accusations, which, of course, have been echoed by *Rabocheye Dyelo.*

The writer of these lines knows very well that the St. Petersburg Economists accused the *Rabochaya Gazeta* of being Narodovolist (which is quite understandable when one compares it with *Rabochaya Mysl*). We were not in the least surprised, therefore, when, soon after the appearance of *Iskra,* a comrade informed us that the Social-Democrats in the town of X describe *Iskra* as a Narodovolist journal. We, of course, were flattered by this accusation, because the Economists would charge every real Social-Democrat with being a Narodovolist. These accusations are called forth by a two-fold misunderstanding. Firstly, the history of the revolutionary movement is so little understood among us that the very idea of a militant centralised organisation which declares a determined war upon tsarism is described as Narodovolist. But the magnificent organisation that the revolutionists had in the seventies and which should serve us all as a model, was not formed by the Narodovolists, but by the adherents of Zemlya i Volya, who split up into Chernoperedeltsi [Black Redistributionists—*i.e.,* of the land.—*Ed.*] and Narodovolists.[219] Consequently, to regard a militant revolutionary organisation as something specifically Narodovolist is absurd both historically and logically, because no revolutionary tendency, if it seriously thinks of fighting, can dispense with such an organisation. But the mistake the Narodovolists committed was not that they strove to recruit to their organisation *all* the discontented, and to hurl this organisation into the battle against the

* Adherents of Narodnaya Volya.—*Ed.*

autocracy; on the contrary, that was their great historical merit. Their mistake was that they relied on a theory which in substance was not a revolutionary theory at all, and they either did not know how, or circumstances did not permit them, to link up their movement inseparably with the class struggle that went on within developing capitalist society. And only a gross failure to understand Marxism (or an "understanding" of it in the spirit of Struvism) could give rise to the opinion that the rise of a mass, spontaneous labour movement *relieves* us of the duty of creating as good an organisation of revolutionists as Zemlya i Volya had in its time, and even a better one. On the contrary, this movement *imposes* this duty upon us, because the spontaneous struggle of the proletariat will not become a genuine "class struggle" until it is led by a strong organisation of revolutionists.

Secondly, many, including apparently B. Krichevsky [*Rabocheye Dyelo,* No. 10, p. 18] misunderstand the polemics that Social-Democrats have always waged against the "conspiratorial" view on the political struggle. We have always protested, and will, of course, continue to protest against *restricting* the political struggle to conspiracies.* But this does not of course mean that we deny the necessity of a strong revolutionary organisation. And in the pamphlet mentioned in the footnote below, after the polemics against reducing the political struggle to a conspiracy, a description is given (as a Social-Democratic ideal) of an organisation so strong as to be able to resort to "rebellion" and to "every other form of attack," ** in order to "deliver a smashing blow against absolutism." The *form* a strong revolutionary organisation like that may take in an autocratic country may be described as a "conspirative" organ-

* *Cf. The Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats,* p. 21. Polemics against P. L. Lavrov. [See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. II.—*Ed.*]

** *Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats,* p. 23. [V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. II.—*Ed.*] But we shall give another illustration of the fact that *Rabocheye Dyelo* either does not understand what it is talking about, or changes its views "with every change in the wind." In No. 1 of *Rabocheye Dyelo,* we find the following passage in italics: "*The views expressed in this pamphlet coincide entirely with the editorial programme of Rabocheye Dyelo* [p. 142]. Is that so, indeed? Does the view that the mass movement must not be set the primary task of overthrowing the autocracy coincide with the views expressed in the pamphlet, *The Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats?* Do the theories about "the economic struggle against the employers and the government," and the theory of stages, coincide with the views expressed in that pamphlet? We leave it to the reader to judge as to whether an organ which understands the meaning of "coincidence" in this peculiar manner can have firm principles.

isation, because the French word "*conspiration*" means in Russian "conspiracy," and we must have the utmost conspiracy for an organisation like that.* Secrecy is such a necessary condition for such an organisation that all the other conditions (number and selection of members, functions, etc.) must all be subordinated to it. It would be extremely naïve indeed, therefore, to fear the accusation that we Social-Democrats desire to create a conspirative organisation. Such an accusation would be as flattering to every opponent of Economism as the accusation of being followers of Narodovolism would be.

Against us it is argued: Such a powerful and strictly secret organisation, which concentrates in its hands all the threads of secret activities, an organisation which of necessity must be a centralised organisation, may too easily throw itself into a premature attack, may thoughtlessly intensify the movement before political discontent, the ferment and anger of the working class, etc., are sufficiently ripe for it. To this we reply: Speaking abstractly, it cannot be denied, of course, that a militant organisation *may* thoughtlessly commence a battle, which *may* end in defeat, which might have been avoided under other circumstances. But we cannot confine ourselves to abstract reasoning on such a question, because every battle bears within itself the abstract possibility of defeat, and there is no other way of *reducing this possibility to a minimum* than by organised preparation for battle. If, however, we base our argument on the concrete conditions prevailing in Russia at the present time, we must come to the positive conclusion that a strong revolutionary organisation is absolutely necessary precisely for the purpose of giving firmness to the movement, and of *safeguarding* it against the possibility of its making premature attacks. It is precisely at the present time, when no such organisation exists yet, and when the revolutionary movement is rapidly and spontaneously growing, that we *already observe* two opposite extremes (which, as is to be expected, "meet") *i. e.*, absolutely unsound Economism and the preaching of moderation, and equally unsound "excitative

* The Russian word for "conspiracy" is *zagovor*, which means "conspiracy" or "plot." But the word *conspiratsiya*, "conspiracy," in Russian revolutionary literature usually means "secrecy." Hence, a conspirative organisation would be a secret organisation, but would not necessarily engage in plots. Except in the above case, when it was important to bring out the play of words, the word "*conspiratsiya*" has been rendered throughout the text as "secrecy," and the word "conspirative" was used only where the word *zagovor* has been used in the text, as in the sub-title of this section.—*Ed.*

terror," which strives artificially to "call forth symptoms of its end in a movement that is developing and becoming strong, but which is as yet nearer to its beginning than to its end" [V. Zasulich, in *Zarya*, Nos. 2-3, p. 353].[220] And the example of *Rabocheye Dyelo* shows that *there are already* Social-Democrats who give way to both these extremes. This is not surprising because, apart from other reasons, the "economic struggle against the employers and the government" *can never* satisfy revolutionists, and because opposite extremes will always arise here and there. Only a centralised, militant organisation, that consistently carries out a Social-Democratic policy, that satisfies, so to speak, all revolutionary instincts and strivings, can safeguard the movement against making thoughtless attacks and prepare it for attacks that hold out the promise of success.

It is further argued against us that the views on organisation here expounded contradict the "principles of democracy." Now while the first mentioned accusation was of purely Russian origin, this one is of *purely foreign* origin. And only an organisation abroad (the League of Russian Social-Democrats) would be capable of giving its editorial board instructions like the following:

> *Principles of Organisation.* In order to secure the successful development and unification of Social-Democracy, broad democratic principles of party organisation must be emphasised, developed and fought for; and this is particularly necessary in view of the anti-democratic tendencies that have become revealed in the ranks of our party. [*Two Congresses*, p. 18.]

We shall see how *Rabocheye Dyelo* fights against *Iskra's* "anti-democratic tendencies" in the next chapter. Here we shall examine more closely the "principle" that the Economists advance. Every one will probably agree that "broad principles of democracy" presupposes the two following conditions: first, full publicity and second, election to all functions. It would be absurd to speak about democracy without publicity, that is a publicity that extends beyond the circle of the membership of the organisation. We call the German Socialist Party a democratic organisation because all it does is done publicly; even its party congresses are held in public. But no one would call an organisation that is hidden from every one but its members by a veil of secrecy, a democratic organisation. What is the use of advancing "*broad* principles of democracy" when the fundamental condition for this principle *cannot be fulfilled* by a secret organisation. "Broad principles" turns out to be a resonant,

but hollow phrase. More than that, this phrase proves that the urgent tasks in regard to organisation are totally misunderstood. Every one knows how great is the lack of secrecy among the "broad" masses of revolutionists. We have heard the bitter complaints of B-v on this score, and his absolutely just demand for a "strict selection of members" [*Rabocheye Dyelo,* No. 6, p. 42]. And yet people who boast about their "sensitiveness to life" come forward in a situation like this and *urge* that strict secrecy and a strict (and therefore more restricted) selection of members is unnecessary, and that what is necessary are—"*broad* principles of democracy"! This is what we call being absolutely wide of the mark.

Nor is the situation with regard to the second attribute of democracy, namely, the principle of election, any better. In politically free countries, this condition is taken for granted. "Membership of the party is open to those who accept the principles of the party programme, and render all the support they can to the party"—says paragraph 1 of the rules of the German Social-Democratic Party. And as the political arena is as open to the public view as is the stage in a theatre, this acceptance or non-acceptance, support or opposition is announced to all in the press and at public meetings. Every one knows that a certain political worker commenced in a certain way, passed through a certain evolution, behaved in difficult periods in a certain way; every one knows all his qualities, and consequently, knowing all the facts of the case, *every party member can decide for himself whether or not to elect this person for a certain party office.* The general control (in the literal sense of the term) that the party exercises over every act this person commits on the political field brings into being an automatically operating mechanism which brings about what in biology is called "survival of the fittest." "Natural selection," full publicity, the principle of election and general control provide the guarantee that, in the last analysis, every political worker will be "in his proper place," will do the work for which he is best fitted, will feel the effects of his mistakes on himself, and prove before all the world his ability to recognise mistakes and to avoid them.

Try to put this picture in the frame of our autocracy! Is it possible in Russia for all those "who accept the principles of the party programme and render it all the support they can," to control every action of the revolutionist working in secret? Is it possible for all the revolutionists to elect one of their number to any partic-

ular office when, in the very interests of the work, he *must conceal his identity* from nine out of ten of these "all"? Ponder a little over the real meaning of the high-sounding phrases that *Rabocheye Dyelo* gives utterance to, and you will realise that "broad democracy" in party organisation, amidst the gloom of autocracy and the domination of the gendarmes, is nothing more than a *useless and harmful toy*. It is a useless toy, because as a matter of fact, no revolutionary organisation has ever practiced *broad* democracy, nor could it, however much it desired to do so. It is a harmful toy, because any attempt to practice the "broad principles of democracy" will simply facilitate the work of the police in making big raids, it will perpetuate the prevailing primitiveness, divert the thoughts of the practical workers from the serious and imperative task of training themselves to become professional revolutionists to that of drawing up detailed "paper" rules for election systems. Only abroad, where very often people who have no opportunity of doing real live work gather together, can the "game of democracy" be played here and there, especially in small groups.

In order to show how ugly *Rabocheye Dyelo's* favourite trick is of advancing the plausible "principle" of democracy in revolutionary affairs, we shall again call a witness. This witness, E. Serebryakov, the editor of the London magazine, *Nakanunye* [*On the Eve*] has a tenderness for *Rabocheye Dyelo*, and is filled with hatred against Plekhanov and the Plekhanovists. In articles that it published on the split in the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, *Nakanunye* definitely took the side of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, and poured a stream of atrocious abuse upon Plekhanov.[221] But this only makes this witness all the more valuable for us on this question. In No. 7 of *Nakanunye* [July, 1899], in an article, entitled, "The Manifesto of the Self-Emancipation of the Workers' Group," E. Serebryakov argues that it was "indecent" to talk about such things as "self-deception, priority, and so-called Areopagus in the serious revolutionary movement," and *inter alia* wrote:

> Myshkin, Rogachev, Zhelyabov, Mikhailov, Perovskaya, Figner, and others never regarded themselves as leaders, and no one ever elected or appointed them as such, although as a matter of fact, they were leaders because both in the propaganda period, as well as in the period of the fight against the government, they took the brunt of the work upon themselves, they went into the most dangerous places and their activities were the most fruitful. Priority came to them not because they wished it, but because the comrades surrounding them had confidence in their wisdom, their energy and loyalty. To

be afraid of some kind of Areopagus [if it is not feared, then why write about it?] that would arbitrarily govern the movement is far too naïve. Who would obey it?

We ask the reader in what way does "Areopagus" differ from "anti-democratic tendencies"? And is it not evident that *Rabocheye Dyelo's* "plausible" organisational principles are equally naïve and indecent; naïve, because no one would obey "Areopagus," or people with "anti-democratic tendencies," if "the comrades surrounding them had no confidence in their wisdom, energy and loyalty"; indecent, because it is a demagogic sally calculated to play on the conceit of some, on the ignorance of the actual state of our movement on the part of others, and the lack of training and ignorance of the history of the revolutionary movement of still others. The only serious organisational principle the active workers of our movement can accept is: Strict secrecy, strict selection of members, and the training of professional revolutionists. If we possessed these qualities, "democracy" and something even more would be guaranteed to us, namely: Complete, comradely, mutual confidence among revolutionists. And this something more is absolutely essential for us because, in Russia, it is useless to think that democratic control can serve as a substitute for it. It would be a great mistake to believe that because it is impossible to esablish real "democratic" control, the members of the revolutionary organisation will remain altogether uncontrolled. They have not the time to think about the toy forms of democracy (democracy within a close and compact body enjoying the complete mutual confidence of the comrades), but they have a lively sense of their *responsibility*, because they know from experience that an organisation of real revolutionists will stop at nothing to rid itself of an undesirable member. Moreover, there is a very well-developed public opinion in Russian (and international) revolutionary circles which has a long history behind it, and which sternly and ruthlessly punishes every departure from the duties of comradeship (and does not "democracy," real and not toy democracy, represent a part of the conception of comradeship?). Take all this into consideration and you will realise that all the talk and resolutions that come from abroad about "anti-democratic tendencies" has a nasty odour of the playing at generals that goes on there.

It must be observed also that the other source of this talk, *i. e.*, naïveté, is also fostered by a confusion of ideas concerning the

meaning of democracy. In Mr. and Mrs. Webb's book on trade unionism,* there is an interesting section on "Primitive Democracy." In this section, the authors relate how, in the first period of existence of their unions, the British workers thought that in the interests of democracy all the members must take part in the work of managing the unions; not only were all questions decided by the votes of all the members, but all the official duties were fulfilled by all the members in turn. A long period of historical experience was required to teach these workers how absurd such a conception of democracy was and to make them understand the necessity for representative institutions on the one hand, and of full-time professional officials on the other. Only after a number of cases of financial bankruptcy of trade unions occurred did the workers realise that rates of benefit cannot be decided merely by a democratic vote, but must be based on the advice of insurance experts. Let us take also Kautsky's book, *Der Parlamentarismus, die Volksgesetzgebung und die Sozialdemokratie.*[222] There you will find that the conclusions drawn by the Marxian theoretician coincides with the lessons learned from many years of experience by the workers who organised "spontaneously." Kautsky strongly protests against Rittinghausen's primitive conception of democracy; he ridicules those who in the name of democracy demand even that "popular newspapers shall be directly edited by the people"; he shows the necessity for *professional* journalists, parliamentarians, etc., and for the Social-Democratic leadership of the proletarian class struggle; he attacks the "Socialism of Anarchists and *litterateurs,*" who in their "striving after effect" proclaim the principle that laws should be passed directly by the whole people, completely failing to understand that in modern society this principle can have only a relative application.

Those who have carried on practical work in our movement know how widespread is the "primitive" conception of democracy among the masses of the students and workers. It is not surprising that this conception permeates rules of organisation and literature. The Economists of the Bernstein persuasion included in their rules the following: "§ 10. All affairs affecting the interests of the whole of the union organisation shall be decided by a majority vote of all its members." The Economists of the terrorist persuasion repeat after them: "The decisions of the committee must be circulated

* *The History of Trade Unionism.*

among all the circles and become effective only after this has been done" [*Svoboda,* No. 1, p. 67]. Observe that this proposal for a widely applied referendum is advanced *in addition* to the demand that *the whole of* the organisation be organised on an elective basis! We would not, of course, on this account condemn practical workers who have had too few opportunities for studying the theory and practice of real democratic organisation. But when *Rabocheye Dyelo,* which claims to play a leading rôle, confines itself, under such conditions, to resolutions about broad democratic principles, how else can it be described than as a "striving after effect"?

F. Local and All-Russian Work

Although the objections raised against the plan for an organisation outlined here on the grounds of its undemocratic and conspirative character are totally unsound, nevertheless a question still remains that is frequently put and which deserves detailed examination. This is the question about the relations between local work and All-Russian work. Fears are expressed that this would lead to the formation of a centralised organisation, and that national work would be over-stressed at the expense of local work; that this would damage the movement, would weaken our contacts with the masses of the workers, and would weaken local agitation generally. To these fears we reply that our movement in the past few years has suffered precisely from the fact that the local workers have been too absorbed in local work. Hence it is absolutely necessary to somewhat shift the weight of the work from local work to national work. This would not weaken, on the contrary, it would strengthen our ties and our local agitation. Take the question of central and local journals. I would ask the reader not to forget that we cite the publication of journals only as *an example,* illustrating an immeasurably broader and more widespread revolutionary activity.

In the first period of the mass movement (1896-1898), an attempt is made by local party workers to publish an All-Russian journal, the *Rabochaya Gazeta.* In the next period (1898-1900), the movement makes enormous strides, but the attention of the leaders is wholly absorbed by local publications. If we add up all the local journals that were published, we shall find that on the

average one paper per month was published.* Does not this illustrate our primitive ways? Does this not clearly show that our revolutionary organisation lags behind the spontaneous growth of the movement? If *the same number* of issues had been published, not by scattered local groups, but by a single organisation, we would not only have saved an enormous amount of effort, but we would have secured immeasurably greater stability and continuity in our work. This simple calculation is very frequently lost sight of by those practical workers who work *actively*, almost exclusively, on local publications (unfortunately this is the case even now in the overwhelming majority of cases) as well as by the publicists who display an astonishing Quixotism on this question. The practical workers usually rest content with the argument that "it is difficult" for local workers to engage in the organisation of an All-Russian newspaper, and that local newspapers are better than no newspapers at all.** The latter argument is, of course, perfectly just, and we shall not be behind any practical worker in our recognition of the enormous importance and usefulness of local newspapers *in general.* But this is not the point. The point is, Can we rid ourselves of the state of diffusion and primitiveness that is so strikingly expressed in the thirty numbers of local newspapers published throughout the whole of Russia in the course of two-and-a-half years? Do not restrict yourselves to indisputable but too general statements about the usefulness of local newspapers generally; have the courage also openly to recognise their defects as have been revealed by the experience of two-and-a-half years. This experience has shown that under the conditions in which we work, these local newspapers prove, in the majority of cases, to be unstable in their principles, lacking in political significance, extremely costly in regard to expenditure of revolutionary effort, and totally unsatisfactory from a technical point of view (I have in mind, of course, not the technique of printing them, but the frequency and regularity of publication). These defects are not accidental; they are the inevitable result of the diffusion which on the one hand ex-

* See *Report to the Paris Congress,* p. 14[223]. "Since that time (1897) to the spring of 1900, thirty issues of various papers were published in various places. . . . On an average, over one number per month was published.

** This difficulty is more apparent than real. As a matter of fact, *there is not a single* local circle that lacks the opportunity of taking up some function or other in connection with All-Russian work. "Don't say: I can't; say: I won't."

plains the predominance of local newspapers in the period under review, and on the other hand *is fostered* by this predominance. A separate local organisation is *positively unable* to maintain stability of principles in its newspaper, and it cannot raise it to the level of a political organ; *it is unable* to collect and utilise sufficient material dealing with the whole of our political life. While, in politically free countries, it is often argued in defence of numerous local newspapers that the cost of printing by local workers is low, and that the local population can be kept more fully and quickly informed, experience has shown that in Russia this argument can be used *against* local newspapers. In Russia, local newspapers prove to be excessively costly in regard to the expenditure of revolutionary effort, and are published *rarely*, for the very simple reason that no matter how small its size, the publication of an *illegal newspaper* requires as large a secret apparatus as is required by a large enterprise, for such an apparatus cannot be run in a small, handicraft workshop. Very frequently, the primitiveness of the secret apparatus (every practical worker knows of numerous cases like this) enables the police to take advantage of the publication and distribution of one or two numbers to make *mass arrests* and to make such a clean sweep that it is necessary afterwards to build up the entire apparatus anew. A well-organised secret apparatus requires professionally well-trained revolutionists and proper division of labour, but neither of these requirements can be met by separate local organisations, no matter how strong they may be at any given moment. Not only are the general interests of our movement as a whole (consistent training of the workers in Socialist and political principles) better served by non-local newspapers, but even specifically local interests are better served. This may seem paradoxical at first sight, but it has been proved up to the hilt by the two-and-a-half years of experience to which we have already referred. Every one will agree that if all the local forces that were engaged in the publication of these thirty issues of newspapers had worked on a single newspaper, they could easily have published sixty if not a hundred numbers, and consequently, would have more fully expressed all the specifically local features of the movement. True, it is not an easy matter to attain such high degree of organisation, but we must recognise the necessity for it. Every local circle must think about it, and *work actively* to achieve it, without waiting to be pushed on from outside; and we must

stop being tempted by the ease and closer proximity of a local newspaper which, as our revolutionary experience has shown, proves to a large extent to be more apparent than real.

And it is a bad service indeed those publicists render to the practical work, who, thinking they stand particularly close to the practical workers, fail to see this deceptiveness, and express the astonishingly cheap and astonishingly hollow argument: We must have local newspapers, we must have district newspapers, and we must have All-Russian newspapers. Generally speaking of course, all these are necessary, but when you undertake to solve a concrete organisational problem surely you must take time and circumstances into consideration. Is it not Quixotic on the part of *Svoboda* [No. 1, p. 68], in a special article "dealing with *the question of a newspaper*" to write: "It seems to us that every locality where any number of workingmen are collected, should have its own labour newspaper. Not a newspaper imported from somewhere or other, but its very own." If the publicist who wrote that refuses to think about the significance of his own words, then at least you, reader, think about it for him. How many scores if not hundreds of "localities where workingmen are collected in any more or less considerable number" are there in Russia, and would it not be simply perpetuating our primitive methods if indeed every local organisation set to work to publish its own newspaper? How this diffusion would facilitate the task of the gendarmes fishing out—without any considerable effort at that—the local party workers at the very beginning of their activity and preventing them from developing into real revolutionists! A reader of an All-Russian newspaper, continues the author, would *not find* descriptions of the misdeeds of the factory-owners and the "details of factory life in other towns outside his district at all interesting." But "an inhabitant of Oryol would not find it dull reading about Oryol affairs. Each time he picked up his paper he would know that some factory-owner was 'caught' and another 'exposed,' and his spirits would begin to soar" [p. 69]. Yes, yes, the spirit of the Oryolian would begin to soar, but the thoughts of our publicist also begin to soar—too high. He should have asked himself: Is it right to concern oneself entirely with defending the striving after small reforms? We are second to no one in our appreciation of the importance and necessity of factory exposures, but it must be borne in mind that we have reached a stage when St. Petersburgians find it dull reading the St.

Petersburg correspondence of the St. Petersburg *Rabochaya Mysl.* Local factory exposures have always been *and should always continue* to be made through the medium of leaflets, but we must raise the level of the *newspaper*, and not degrade it to the level of a factory leaflet. We do not require "petty" exposures for our "newspaper." We require exposures of the important, typical evils of factory life, exposures based on the most striking facts, and capable of interesting *all* workers and all leaders of the movement, capable of really enriching their knowledge, widening their outlook, and of rousing new districts and new professional strata of the workers.

"Moreover, in a local newspaper, the misdeeds of the factory officials and other authorities may be seized upon immediately, and caught red-handed. In the case of a general newspaper, however, by the time the news reaches the paper, and by the time they are published, the facts will have been forgotten in the localities in which they occurred. The reader, when he gets the paper, will say: 'God knows when that happened!'" [*ibid*]. Exactly: God knows when it happened. As we know, from the source I have already quoted, during two-and-a-half years, thirty issues of newspapers were published in six cities. This, on the average, is *one issue per city per half year.* And even if our frivolous publicist *trebled* his estimate of the productivity of local work (which would be wrong in the case of an average city, because it is impossible to increase productivity to any extent by our primitive methods), we would still get only one issue every two months, *i. e.*, nothing at all like "catching them red-handed." It would be sufficient, however, to combine a score or so of local organisations, and assign active functions to their delegates in organising a general newspaper, to enable us to "seize upon," *over the whole of Russia*, not petty, but really outstanding and typical evils once every fortnight. No one who has any knowledge at all of the state of affairs in our organisations can have the slightest doubt about that. It is quite absurd to talk about an illegal newspaper capturing the enemy red-handed, that is, if we mean it seriously and not merely as a metaphor. That can only be done by an anonymous leaflet, because an incident like that can only be of interest for a matter of a day or two (take, for example, the usual, brief strikes, beatings in a factory, demonstrations, etc.).

"The workers not only live in factories, they also live in the cities," continues our author, rising from the particular to the gen-

eral, with a strict consistency that would have done honour to Boris Krichevsky himself; and he refers to matters like the city councils, city hospitals, city schools, and demands that labour newspapers generally deal with these municipal affairs. This demand is an excellent one in itself, but it serves as a remarkable illustration of the empty abstraction which too frequently characterises discussions about local newspapers. First of all, if indeed newspapers appeared "in every place where any number of workers are gathered" with such detailed information on municipal affairs as *Svoboda* desires, it would, under our Russian conditions, inevitably lead to striving for small reform, to a weakening of the consciousness of the importance of an All-Russian revolutionary attack upon the tsarist autocracy, and would strengthen that extremely virile tendency, which has already become notorious by the famous remark about revolutionists who talk more about non-existent parliaments, and too little about existing city councils, and which has not been uprooted but rather temporarily suppressed.[224] We say "inevitably," deliberately, in order to emphasise that *Svoboda* obviously does not want this but the contrary to happen. But good intentions are not enough. In order that municipal affairs may be dealt with in their proper perspective, in relation to the whole of our work, this perspective must be clearly conceived from the *very outset;* it must be firmly established, not only by argument, but by numerous examples in order that it may acquire the firmness of a *tradition.* This is far from being the case with us yet. And yet this must be done *from the very outset,* before we can even think and talk about an extensive local press.

Secondly, in order to be able to write well and interestingly about municipal affairs, one must know these questions not only from books, but from practical experience. And there are hardly any Social-Democrats *anywhere in Russia* who possess this knowledge. In order to be able to write in newspapers (not in popular pamphlets) about municipal and state affairs, one must have fresh and multifarious material collected and worked up by able journalists. And in order to be able to collect and work up such material, we must have something more than the "primitive democracy" of a primitive circle, in which everybody does everything and all entertain one another by playing at referendums. For this it is necessary to have a staff of expert writers, expert correspondents, an army of Social-Democratic reporters, that has established contacts far and

wide, able to penetrate into all sorts of "state secrets" (about which the Russian government official is so puffed up, but which he so easily blabs), find its way "behind the scenes," an army of men and women whose "official duty" it must be to be ubiquitous and omniscient. And we, the party that fights against *all* economic, political, social and national oppression can and must find, collect, train, mobilise, and set into motion such an army of omniscient people—but all this has yet to be done! Not only has not a single step been taken towards this in the overwhelming majority of cases, but in many places the necessity for doing it is *not even recognised.* You will search in vain in our Social-Democratic press for lively and interesting articles, correspondence, and exposures of our diplomatic, military, ecclesiastical, municipal, financial, etc., etc., affairs and malpractices. You will find *almost nothing*, or very little, about these things.* That is why "I am always frightfully annoyed when a man comes to me and says all sorts of nice things" about the necessity for newspapers that will expose factory, municipal, and government evils "in every place where any considerable number of workers are collected!"

The predominance of the local press over the central press may be either a symptom of poverty, or a symptom of luxury. Of poverty, when the movement has not yet developed the forces for large-scale production, and continues to flounder in primitive ways and in "the petty details of factory life." Of luxury, when the movement, having *already mastered the task* of all-sided exposure and all-sided agitation, finds it necessary to publish numerous local newspapers in addition to the central organ. Let each one decide for himself as to what the predominance of local newspapers implies at the present time. I shall limit myself to a precise formulation of my own conclusion, in order to avoid misunderstanding. Hitherto the majority of our local organisations devoted their minds

* That is why even examples of exceptionally good local newspapers fully confirm our point-of-view. For example, *Yuzhny Rabochy* is an excellent newspaper, and is altogether free from instability of principles. But it was unable to provide what it desired for the local movement owing to the infrequency of its publication and to extensive police raids. What our party must do most urgently at the present time is to present the fundamental questions of the movement, and carry on wide political agitation, but this the local newspaper was unable to do. And that which it did exceptionally well, namely, publish articles about the mine-owners' congress, unemployment, etc., was not strictly local material, *it was required for the whole of Russia,* and not for the South alone. No articles like that have appeared in any of our Social-Democratic newspapers.

almost exclusively to local newspapers, and devoted almost all their activities to this work. This is unsound—the very opposite should be the case. The majority of the local organisations should devote their minds principally to the publication of an All-Russian newspaper, and devote their activities principally to this work. Until that is done, we shall never be able to establish *a single newspaper* capable to any degree of serving the movement with *all-sided* press agitation. When that is done, however, normal relations between the necessary central newspapers and the necessary local newspapers will be established automatically.

It would seem at first sight that the conclusion drawn, concerning the necessity for transferring the weight of effort from local work to All-Russian work, does not apply to the specifically economic struggle. In this struggle, the immediate enemy of the workers are individual employers or groups of employers, who are not bound by any organisation having even the remotest resemblance to a purely militant, strictly centralised organisation led in all its minutest details by the single will of the organised Russian government—which is our immediate enemy in the political struggle.

But that is not the case. As we have already pointed out many times, the economic struggle is a trade struggle, and for that reason it requires that the workers be organised according to trade and not only according to their place of employment. And this organisation by trade becomes all the more imperatively necessary, the more rapidly our employers organise in all sorts of companies and syndicates. Our state of diffusion and our primitiveness hinders this work of organisation, and in order that this work may be carried out, we must have a single, All-Russian organisation of revolutionists capable of undertaking the leadership of the All-Russian trade unions. We have already described above the type of organisation that is desired for this purpose, and now we shall add just a few words about this in connection with the question of our press.

Hardly any one will doubt the necessity for every Social-Democratic newspaper having a special section devoted to the trade-union (economic) struggle. But the growth of the trade-union movement compels us to think about the trade-union press. It seems to us, however, that with rare exceptions, it is not much use thinking of trade-union newspapers in Russia at the present time: That would be a luxury, and in many places we cannot even obtain our

daily bread. The form of trade-union press that would suit the conditions of our illegal work and that is already called for at the present time is the *Trade-Union Pamphlet.* In these pamphlets, *legal* * and illegal material should be collected and organised, on conditions of labour in a given trade, on the various conditions prevailing in the various parts of Russia, on the principal demands advanced by the workers in a given trade, about the defects of the laws in relation to that trade, of the outstanding cases of workers' economic struggle in this trade, about the rudiments, the present state and the requirements of their trade-union organisations, etc. Such pamphlets would, in the first place, relieve our Social-Democratic press of a mass of trade details that interest only the workers employed in the given trade; secondly, they would record the results of our experience in the trade-union struggle, would preserve the material collected—which is now literally lost in a mass of leaflets and fragmentary correspondence—and would generalise this material. Thirdly, they could serve as material for the guidance of agitators, because conditions of labour change relatively slowly, the principal demands of the workers in a given trade hardly ever change (see for example the demands advanced by the weavers in the Moscow district in 1885 and in the St. Petersburg district in 1896), and a compilation of these demands and needs might serve

* Legal material is particularly important in this connection, but we have lagged behind very much in our ability systematically to collect and utilise it. It would not be an exaggeration to say that legal material alone would provide sufficient material for a trade-union pamphlet, whereas illegal material alone would not be sufficient. In collecting illegal material from workers, on questions like those dealt with in the publications of *Rabochaya Mysl*,[225] we waste a lot of the efforts of revolutionists (whose place in this work, could very easily be taken by legal workers), and yet we never obtain good material because a worker who knows only a single department of a large factory, who knows the economic results but not the general conditions and standards of his work, cannot acquire the knowledge that is possessed by the office staff of a factory, by inspectors, doctors, etc., and which is scattered in petty newspaper correspondence, and in special, industrial, medical, Zemstvo and other publications.

I very distinctly remember my "first experiment," which I am not going to repeat. I spent many weeks "examining" a workingman, who came to visit me, about the conditions prevailing in the enormous factory at which he was employed. True, after great effort, I managed to obtain material for a description (of just one single factory!), but at the end of each interview the workingman would wipe the sweat from his brow, and say to me smilingly: "I would rather work overtime than reply to your questions!"[226]

The more energetically we carry on our revolutionary struggle, the more the government will be compelled to legalise a part of the "trade-union" work, and by that will relieve us of part of our burden.

for years as an excellent handbook for agitators on economic questions in backward localities, or among backward strata of the workers. Examples of successful strikes, information about the higher standard of life, of better conditions of labour, in one district, would encourage the workers in other districts to take up the fight again and again. Fourthly, having made a start in generalising the trade-union struggle, and having in this way strengthened the contacts between the Russian trade-union movement and Socialism, the Social-Democrats would at the same time see to it that our trade-union work did not occupy either too small or too large a share of our general Social-Democratic work. A local organisation, that is cut off from the organisations in other towns, finds it very difficult, and sometimes almost impossible, to maintain a correct sense of proportion (and the example of *Rabochaya Mysl* shows what a monstrous exaggeration is sometimes made in the direction of trade unionism). But an All-Russian organisation of revolutionists, that stands undeviatingly on the basis of Marxism, leads the whole of the political struggle and possesses a staff of professional agitators, will never find it difficult to determine the proper proportion.

V

THE "PLAN" FOR AN ALL-RUSSIAN POLITICAL NEWSPAPER

"THE most serious blunder *Iskra* made in this connection," writes B. Krichevsky [*Rabocheye Dyelo,* No. 10, p. 30], accusing us of betraying a tendency to "convert theory into a lifeless doctrine by isolating it from practice"—"was in promoting its 'plan' for general party organisation" [*i. e.,* the article entitled "Where to Begin"] and Martynov echoes this idea by declaring that *Iskra's* tendency to belittle the march of the drab, every-day struggle in comparison with the propaganda of brilliant and complete ideas . . . was crowned by the plan for the organisation of a party that it advances in an article in No. 4, entitled "Where to Begin?" [*ibid.,* p. 61]. Finally, L. Nadezhdin has recently joined in the chorus of indignation against the "plan" (the quotation marks were meant to express sarcasm). In a pamphlet we have just received written by him, entitled *The Eve of Revolution* (published by the Revolutionary Socialist group, *Svoboda,* whose acquaintance we have already made), he declares that: "To speak now of an organisation to be linked up with an All-Russian newspaper means to propagate armchair ideas and armchair work" [p. 126], that it is a manifestation of "literariness," etc.

It does not surprise us that our terrorist agrees with the champions of the "forward march of the drab, every-day struggle," because we have already traced the roots of this intimacy between them in the chapters on politics and organisation. But we must here draw attention to the fact that L. Nadezhdin is the only one who has conscientiously tried to understand the ideas expressed in an article he disagrees with, and has made an attempt to reply to it, whereas *Rabocheye Dyelo* has said nothing that is material to the subject, but has tried only to confuse the question by a whole series of indecent, demagogic sallies. Unpleasant though the task may be, we must spend a little time on cleaning this Augean stable.

A. WHO WAS OFFENDED BY THE ARTICLE "WHERE TO BEGIN"?

We shall quote a bouquet of the expletives and exclamations that *Rabocheye Dyelo* hurled at us. "A newspaper cannot create a party

organisation; on the contrary, a party organisation must create a newspaper. . . ." "A newspaper, standing *above* the party, *outside of its control* and independent of it, thanks to its having its own staff of agents. . . ." "By what miracle has *Iskra* forgotten about the actual existence of the Social-Democratic organisations of the party to which it belongs? . . ." "Those who possess firm principles and a corresponding plan are the supreme regulators of the real struggle of the party and dictate to it their plan. . . ." "The plan drives our live and virile organisations into the kingdom of shadows and desires to call into being a fantastic network of agents. . . ." "If *Iskra's* plans were carried out, every trace of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, which is growing up in Russia, would be completely wiped out. . . ." "The propagandist organ becomes an uncontrolled autocratic legislator for the whole of the practical revolutionary struggle. . . ." "What should be the attitude of our party towards the proposal for its *complete* subordination to an autonomous editorial board?", etc., etc.

As the reader can see from the contents and tone of the above quotations, *Rabocheye Dyelo feels offended.* But it is offended, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the organisations and committees of our party which it alleges *Iskra* desires to drive into the kingdom of shadows, and the traces of which it desires to obliterate. Terrible, isn't it? But a curious thing should be noted. The article "Where to Begin" appeared in May, 1901. The articles in *Rabocheye Dyelo* appeared in September, 1901. Now we are in the middle of January, 1902. During these five months, *not a single committee and not a single organisation of the party* (neither before nor after September) protested against this monster which desires to drive them into the kingdom of shadows; and yet scores and hundreds of communications from all parts of Russia have appeared during this period in *Iskra,* and in numerous local and non-local publications. How is it that those whom it is desired to drive into the kingdom of shadows are not aware of it and have not felt offended about it, but a third party is offended over it?

This is to be explained by the fact that the committees and other organisations are engaged in real work and do not play at "democracy." The committees read the article "Where to Begin," saw that it was an attempt "to work out a certain plan of organisation *by which the setting up of this organisation could be approached from all sides,*" and as they knew very well that *not one* of these "sides"

will dream of "setting to work to build it" until it is convinced of its necessity, and of the correctness of the architectural plan, they naturally felt no offence at the boldness of the people who in *Iskra* said: "In view of the urgency and importance of the question, we take it upon ourselves to submit to our comrades an outline of a plan which is developed in greater detail in a pamphlet that we are preparing for the press." Assuming people were actuated by motives of good-will, would they not understand that if the comrades *accepted* the plan submitted to them, they would carry it out, not because they are "subordinate" but because they were convinced of its necessity for our common cause, and that if they *did not accept it*, then the "outline" (a pretentious word, is it not?) would remain merely an outline? Is it not sheer demagogy to oppose the outline of a plan, not only by "picking it to pieces" and advising comrades to reject it, but also by *inciting* those inexperienced in revolutionary affairs against the authors of the plan *merely on the grounds* that they *dare* to "legislate" and come out as the "supreme regulators," *i. e.*, because they dare to *propose* an outline of a plan? Can our party develop and make progress if an attempt to *broaden* the outlook of local party workers so that they may be able to appreciate broader views, tasks, plans, etc., is objected to, not on the ground that these views are wrong, but on the grounds that the very "desire" to *broaden* is "offensive"? L. Nadezhdin also "picked our plan to pieces," but he did not sink to such demagogy—demagogy that cannot be explained by naïveté or by primitiveness of political views. Right from the outset, he emphatically rejected the charge that we intended to establish an "inspectorship over the party." That is why Nadezhdin's criticism of the plan deserves serious treatment, while *Rabocheye Dyelo* deserves only to be treated with contempt.

But contempt for a writer, who sinks to shouting about "autocracy" and "subordination," does not relieve us of the duty of disentangling the confusion that such people create in the minds of their readers, and here we can demonstrate to the world the nature of the catchwords like "broad democracy." We are accused of forgetting the committees, of desiring or attempting to drive them into the kingdom of shadows, etc. How can we reply to these charges when, owing to considerations of secrecy, we are *not in a position* to tell the reader *anything* about our real relationships with the committees. The people who broadcast slashing accusations which excite the people appear to be ahead of us because of their recklessness

and their neglect of the duty of a revolutionist carefully to conceal from the eyes of the world the relationships and contacts he has, which he is establishing or trying to establish. Naturally, we absolutely refuse once for all to compete with such people on the field of "democracy."

As for the reader who is not enlightened on all party affairs, the only way in which we can fulfil our duty to him is to tell him, not about what is and what is *im Werden* * but about a particle of what has taken place and what it is permissible to tell him in view of its being an event of the past.

The Bund hints that we are "pretenders"; ** the League abroad accuses us of attempting to obliterate all traces of the party. Gentlemen, you will get complete satisfaction when we relate to the public *four facts* concerning the past.

First fact.*** The members of one of the Leagues of Struggle, who took a direct part in the formation of our party, and in sending a delegate to the party congress which established the party, came to an agreement with one of the members of the *Iskra* group about the foundation of a special workers' library in order to satisfy the needs of the whole of the movement.[229] The attempt to publish a library failed, and the pamphlets written for it: *The Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats,* and *The New Factory Act,***** by a roundabout way, and through the medium of third parties, found their way abroad, and were there published.

Second fact. The members of the Central Committee of the Bund came to one of the members of the *Iskra* group with the proposal to organise what the Bund then described as a "literary laboratory."[230] In making the proposal, they stated that unless this was done, the movement would retrogress very much. The result of these negotiations was the appearance of the pamphlet, *The Cause of Labour in Russia.******

* What is in the process of becoming.—*Ed.*

** *Iskra,* No. 8. The reply of the Central Committee of the Bund to our article on the national question.[227]

*** We deliberately refrain from relating these facts in the order in which they occurred.[228]

**** See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. II.—*Ed.*

***** The author of this pamphlet asks me to state that this pamphlet, like the one he wrote previously, was sent to the League on the assumption that the editors of its publications were the Emancipation of Labour group (owing to certain circumstances, he could not then—February, 1899—know about the change in the editorship). This pamphlet will be republished by the League at an early date.

Third fact. The Central Committee of the Bund, *via* a provincial town, came to one of the members of *Iskra* with the proposal that he accept the post of editor of the revived *Rabochaya Gazeta* and, of course, received his consent. This proposal was later modified. The comrade in question was invited to act as a contributor, in view of a new arrangement that had been made with the editorial board. To this also consent was, of course, given.[231] Articles were sent (which we managed to preserve); "Our Programme" which was a direct protest against Bernsteinism, against the change of policy in legal literature and in *Rabochaya Mysl;* "Our Immediate Tasks" ("The publication of a party organ that shall appear regularly and have close contacts with all the local groups"; the drawbacks of the prevailing "primitive methods"); "Urgent questions" (an examination of the argument that it is necessary *first of all* to develop the activities of local groups before undertaking the publication of a central organ; an insistence on the paramount importance of a "revolutionary organisation," and on the necessity of "developing organisation, discipline, and the technique of secrecy to the highest stage of perfection").* The proposal to resume publication of *Rabochaya Gazeta* was not carried out, and the articles were not published.

Fourth fact. A member of the committee that organised the second regular congress of our party communicated to a member of the *Iskra* group the programme of the congress, and proposed that group for the office of editing the revived *Rabochaya Gazeta.* This preliminary step, as it were, was later sanctioned by the committee to which this member belonged, and by the Central Committee of the Bund; the *Iskra* group was notified of the place and time of the congress and (not being sure of being able, for certain reasons, to send a delegate to the congress), drew up a written report for the congress. In this report, the idea was suggested that the mere election of a central committee would not only not solve the question of the amalgamation at a time like this, when complete confusion reigns, but may even compromise the grand idea of establishing a party, in the event of an early and complete discovery of the organisation, and a raid by the police, which was more than likely in view of the prevailing lack of secrecy, and that therefore, a beginning should be made by inviting all committees and all other organisations to support the revived common organ, which will

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. II.—*Ed.*

establish *real contacts* between all the committees and *really* train a group of leaders to lead the whole movement; that the committees and the party could very easily transform this group into a central committee as soon as the group had grown and become strong. The congress, however, never took place owing to a number of police raids and arrests; for reasons of secrecy, the report was destroyed, having been read only by several comrades including the representatives of one committee.[232]

Let the reader now judge for himself the character of the methods employed by the Bund in hinting that we were pretenders, or by *Rabocheye Dyelo,* who accuses us of trying to relegate the committees to the kingdom of shadows, and to "substitute" an organisation for advocating the idea of a single newspaper for the organisation of a party. Yes, we did report to the committees, *on their repeated invitation,* on the necessity for accepting a definite plan of work in common. It was precisely for the party organisations that we drew up this plan, in articles published in *Rabochaya Gazeta,* and in the report to the party congress, again on the invitation of those who occupied such an influential position in the party that they took the initiative in its (actual) revival. And only after the *two-fold* attempt of the party organisation, *in conjunction with ourselves,* to revive the central organ of the party *officially* had failed, did we think it our bounden duty to publish an *unofficial* organ, in order that with this *third* attempt the comrades may have before them the results of an *experiment* and not merely problematical proposals. Now certain results of this experiment are available to the view of all, and all comrades may now judge as to whether we properly understood our duties, and what must be thought of people who strive to mislead those who are unacquainted with the immediate past, simply because they are chagrined at our having proved to some their inconsistency on the "national" question, and to others the inadmissibility of their waverings in matters of principles.

B. Can a Newspaper Be a Collective Organiser?

The main points in the article "Where to Begin" deal *precisely* with this question, and reply to it positively. As far as we know, the only attempt to examine this question and to reply to it in the

negative, was made by L. Nadezhdin, whose argument we reproduce in full:

> . . . The manner in which the question of the necessity for an All-Russian newspaper is presented in *Iskra*, No. 4, pleases us very much, but we cannot agree that such a presentation is suitable in an article bearing the title, "Where to Begin." Undoubtedly this is an extremely important matter, but neither a newspaper, nor a whole series of popular leaflets, nor a whole mountain of manifestoes, can serve as the basis for a militant organisation in revolutionary times. We must set to work to build up strong political organisations in the localities. We lack such organisations; we have been carrying on our work mainly among intelligent workers, while the masses have been engaged almost exclusively in the economic struggle. *If we do not build up strong political organisations locally, what will be the use of even an excellently organised all-Russian newspaper?* It will be a burning bush, burning without being consumed and consuming nothing! *Iskra* thinks that as a matter of fact people will gather around it, and they will organise. *But they will find it more interesting to gather and organise around something more concrete!* This something more concrete may be the extensive publication of local newspapers, the immediate setting to work to rally the forces of labour for demonstrations, constant work by local organisations among the unemployed (regularly distribute pamphlets and leaflets among them, convene meetings for them, call upon them to resist the government, etc.). We must organise live political work in the localities, and when the time comes to amalgamate on this real basis—it will not be an artificial, a paper amalgamation—it will not be by means of newspapers that such an amalgamation of local work into an All-Russian cause will be achieved! [*The Eve of the Revolution*, p. 54.]

We have emphasised the passages in this eloquent tirade which most strikingly illustrate the author's incorrect judgement of our plan, and the incorrectness of the point of view generally that he opposes to that of *Iskra*. Unless we set up strong political organisations in the localities—even an excellently organised All-Russian newspaper will be of no avail. Absolutely true. But the whole point is that *there is no other way of training* strong political organisations except through the medium of an All-Russian newspaper. The author missed the most important statement *Iskra* made *before it proceeded* to explain its "plan": That it was necessary "to call for the establishment of a revolutionary organisation, capable of combining all the forces, and of leading the movement *not only in name* but in deed, *i. e., that will be ready at any moment to support every protest and every outbreak,* and to utilise these for the purpose of increasing and strengthening the militant forces required for decisive battle." After the February and March events, every one will agree with this in principle, continues *Iskra,* but we do not need a solution of this problem in principle *but a practical solution of it;* we must immediately bring forward a definite plan of construction in

order that every one may set to work to build *from every side.* And now we are again being dragged away from a practical solution towards something that is correct in principle, indisputable and great, but absolutely inadequate and absolutely incomprehensible to the broad masses of workers, namely, to "build up strong political organisations!" This is not the point that is now being discussed, most worthy author! The point is, *How* to train and what training it should be?

It is not true to say that "we have been carrying on our work mainly among intelligent workers, while the masses have been engaged almost exclusively in the economic struggle." Presented in such a form, this postulate goes wrong on the point which *Svoboda* always goes wrong on, and which is radically wrong, and that is, it sets up the intelligent workers in contrast to the "masses." Even the intelligent workers have been "engaged almost exclusively in the economic struggle" during the past few years. Moreover, the masses will never learn to conduct the political struggle until we help to *train* leaders for this struggle, both from among the intelligent workers and from among the intellectuals; and such leaders can be trained *solely* by systematic and every-day appreciation of *all* aspects of our political life, of *all attempts* at protest and struggle on the part of various classes and on various pretexts. Therefore, to talk about "training political organisations" and at the same time to *contrast* a "paper organisation" of a political newspaper to "live political work in the localities" is simply ridiculous! Why, *Iskra* has adapted its "plan" for a newspaper to the "plan" for creating a "militant preparedness" to support the unemployed movement, peasant revolts, discontent among the Zemstvoists, "popular indignation against the reckless tsarist Bashi-Buzuks," etc. Every one who is at all acquainted with the movement knows perfectly well that the majority of local organisations *never dream* of these things, that many of the prospects of "live political work" *have never* been realised by a single organisation, that the attempt to call attention to the growth of discontent and protest among the Zemstvo intelligentsia rouses feelings of consternation and amazement in Nadezhdin ("Good Lord, is this newspaper intended for the Zemstvoists?"—*The Eve of the Revolution*, p. 129), among the Economists (Letter to *Iskra* No. 12) and among many of the practical workers. Under these circumstances, it is possible to "begin" *only* by stirring up people *to think* about all these things, to stir them up to summarise

and generalise all the flashes of discontent and active struggle. "Live political work" can be commenced in our time, when Social-Democratic tasks are being degraded, *exclusively* with live political education, which is impossible unless we have a frequently issued and properly distributed All-Russian newspaper.

Those who regard *Iskra's* "plan" as a manifestation of literariness have totally failed to understand the substance of the plan, and imagine that what is suggested as the most suitable means for the present time is the ultimate goal. These people have not taken the trouble to study the two comparisons that were drawn to illustrate the plan proposed. *Iskra* wrote: The publication of an All-Russian political newspaper must be *the main line* that must guide us in our work of unswervingly developing, deepening, and expanding this organisation (*i. e.*, a revolutionary organisation always prepared to support every protest and every outbreak). Pray tell me: When a bricklayer lays bricks in various parts of an enormous structure, the like of which has never been seen before, is it a "paper" line that he uses to help him to find the correct place to place each brick, to indicate to him the ultimate goal of the work as a whole, to enable him to use not only every brick but even every piece of brick, which, joining with the bricks placed before and after it, forms a complete and all-embracing line? And are we not now passing through a period in our party life, when we have bricks and bricklayers, but we lack the guiding line, visible to all, by which to guide our movements? Let them shout that in stretching out the line, we desire to command. Had we desired to command, gentlemen, we would have written on the title page, not "*Iskra,* No. 1," but "*Rabochaya Gazeta,* No. 3," as we were invited to do by a number of comrades, and *as we had a perfect right to do* after the events related above took place. But we did not do that. We wished to have our hands free to conduct an irreconcilable struggle against all pseudo-Social-Democrats; we wanted our line of policy, if properly laid, to be respected because it was correct, and not because it was carried out by an official organ.

"The question of combining local activity in central organs runs in a vicious circle," L. Nadezhdin tells us pedantically, "for this requires homogeneous elements, and this homogeneity can be created only by something that combines; but this combining element may be the product of strong local organisations which at the present time are not distinguished for their homogeneity." This

truism is as hoary and indisputable as the one that: We must build up strong political organisations. And is equally barren. *Every* question "runs in a vicious circle" because the whole of political life is an endless chain consisting of an infinite number of links. The whole art of politics lies in finding the link that can be least torn out of our hands, the one that is most important at the given moment, the one that guarantees the command of the whole chain, and having found it, to cling to that link as tightly as possible.* If we possessed a staff of experienced bricklayers who had learned to work so well together that they could dispense with a guiding line and could place their bricks exactly where they are required without one (and speaking abstractly, this is by no means impossible), then perhaps we might seize upon some other link. But the unfortunate thing is that we have no experienced bricklayers trained to teamwork, that bricks are often laid where they are not needed at all, that they are not laid according to the general line, and are so scattered about that the enemy can shatter the structure as if it were made not of bricks but of sand.

Here is the other comparison:

> A newspaper is not merely a collective propagandist and collective agitator, it is also a collective organiser. In that respect, it *can be compared to the scaffolding* erected around a building in construction; it marks the contours of the structure, and facilitates communication between the builders, permitting them to distribute the work, and to view the common results achieved by their organised labour.**

Does this sound anything like the attempt of an armchair author to exaggerate his rôle? The scaffolding put up around a building is not required at all for habitation, it is made of the cheapest material, it is only put up temporarily and when finished with, as soon as the shell of the structure is completed, is destroyed. As for the building up of revolutionary organisations, experience shows that sometimes they may be built without scaffolding,—take the seventies

* Comrade Krichevsky and Comrade Martynov! I call your attention to this outrageous manifestation of "autocracy," "uncontrolled authority," "supreme regulating," etc. Just think of it: a desire to *possess* the whole chain!! Send in a complaint at once. Here you have a subject for two leading articles for No. 12 of *Rabocheye Dyelo!* [233]

** Martynov, quoting the first sentence in this passage in *Rabocheye Dyelo* [No. 10, p. 62] left out the second sentence, as if desiring to emphasise by that either his unwillingness to discuss the essentials of the question, or his incapability of understanding it.

for example. But at the present time we cannot imagine that the building we require can be put up without scaffolding.

Nadezhdin disagrees with this, and says: "*Iskra* thinks that people will gather around it and will organise, *but they will find it more interesting to organise around something more concrete!*" So! so! "They will find it more interesting to gather around something more concrete. . . ." There is a Russian proverb which says: "Don't spit into the well, you may want to drink out of it." But there are people who do not object to drinking from a well which has been spat into. What despicable things our magnificent, legal "critics of Marxism" and illegal admirers of *Rabochaya Mysl* have said in the name of this—something more concrete! See how restricted our movement is by our own narrowness, lack of initiative, and hesitation and yet this is justified by the traditional argument about "finding it more interesting to gather around something more concrete!" And Nadezhdin, who regards himself as being particularly sensitive to "life," who so severely condemns "armchair" authors, who (with pretensions to being witty) charges *Iskra* with a weakness for seeing Economism everywhere, and who imagines that he stands far above this discrimination between the "orthodox" and the "critics,"—fails to see that with this sort of argument he is playing into the hands of the very narrowness with which he is so indignant and that he is drinking from a well that has actually been spat into! The sincerest indignation against narrowness, the most passionate desire to raise those who worship this narrowness from their knees, is insufficient if the indignant one is swept along without sail or rudder as "spontaneously" as the revolutionists of the seventies, if he clutches at such things as "excitative terror," "agrarian terror," "sounding-the-tocsin," etc. Glance at this something "more concrete" around which he thinks it is "much easier" to rally and organise: 1. Local newspapers; 2. Preparations for demonstrations; 3. Work among the unemployed. It will be seen at the very first glance that all these have been seized upon at random in order to be able to say something, for however we may regard them, it would be absurd to see in them anything especially adapted for the purpose of "rallying and organising." This very Nadezhdin a few pages further on says: "It is time we simply stated the fact that extremely petty work is being carried on in the localities, the committees are not doing a tenth of what they could do . . . the combining centres that we have at the present time are a pure

fiction, they represent a sort of revolutionary bureaucracy, the members of which mutually appoint each other to the posts of generals; and so it will continue until strong local organisations grow up." These remarks, while exaggerating the position somewhat, express many a bitter truth, but cannot Nadezhdin see the connection between the petty work carried on in the localities and the narrow outlook of the party workers, the narrow scope of their activities, which is inevitable in view of the lack of training of the party workers isolated in their local organisations? Has he, like the author of the article on organisation published in *Svoboda*, forgotten how the adoption of a broad local press (in 1898) was accompanied by a very strong intensification of Economism and "primitive methods"? Even if a broad local press could be established at all satisfactorily (and we have shown above that it is impossible save in very exceptional cases)—even then the local organs could not "rally and organise" *all* the revolutionary forces for a *general* attack upon the autocracy and for the leadership of a *united* struggle. Do not forget that we are here discussing *only* the "rallying," the organising significance of a newspaper, and we could put to Nadezhdin, who defends diffusiveness, the very question that he himself has already put ironically: "Has some one left us a legacy of 200,000 revolutionary organisers?" Furthermore, "preparations for demonstrations" cannot be set up in *contrast* to *Iskra's* plan for the one reason alone that this plan includes the organisation of the widest possible demonstrations *as one of its aims;* the point under discussion is the selection of the practical *means.* On this point also Nadezhdin has got confused and has lost sight of the fact that only already "rallied and organised" forces can "prepare for" demonstrations (which hitherto, in the overwhelming majority of cases, have taken place quite spontaneously) and we *lack precisely the ability* to rally and organise. "Work among the unemployed." Again the same confusion, for this too represents one of the military operations of mobilised forces and not a plan to mobilise the forces. The extent to which Nadezhdin underestimates the harm caused by our diffusion, by our lack of "200,000 men," can be seen from the following: Many (including Nadezhdin) have reproached *Iskra* with the paucity of the news it gives about unemployment and with the casual nature of the correspondence it publishes about the most common affairs of rural life. The reproach is justified, but *Iskra* is "guilty without sin." We

strive to "draw a line" even through the countryside, but there are almost no bricklayers there, and we are *obliged* to encourage *every one* to send us information concerning even the most common facts in the hope that this will increase the number of our contributors in this field and will *train us all* at least to select the really most outstanding facts. But the material upon which we can train is so scanty that unless we collect it from all parts of Russia we will have very little to train upon at all. No doubt, one who possesses at least as much capacity as an agitator and as much knowledge of the life of the vagrant as apparently Nadezhdin has, could render priceless service to the movement by carrying on agitation among the unemployed—but such a one would be simply burying his talents if he failed to inform *all* Russian comrades of every step he took in his work, in order that others, who, in the mass, as yet lack the ability to undertake new kinds of work, may learn from his example.

Absolutely everybody now talks about the importance of unity, about the necessity for "rallying and organising," but the majority of us lack a definite idea of where to begin and how to bring about this unification. Every one will probably agree that if we "unite" say, the district circles in a given city, it will be necessary to have for this purpose *common institutions*, *i. e.*, not merely a common title of "League" but genuinely *common* work, exchange of material, experience, and forces, distribution of functions, not only in the given districts but in a whole city, according to special tasks. Every one will agree that a big secret apparatus will not pay its way (if one may employ a commercial expression) "with the resources" (in material and manpower, of course) of a single district and that a single district will not provide sufficient scope for a specialist to develop his talents. But the same thing applies to the unification of a number of cities, because even such a field, like a single locality, *will prove*, and has already proved in the history of our Social-Democratic movement, to be too restricted: we have already dealt with this in detail above, in connection with political agitation and organisational work. We must first and foremost widen the field, establish *real* contacts between the cities, on the basis of *regular*, *common* work; for diffusion restricts the activities of our people who are "stuck in a hole" (to use the expression employed by a correspondent to *Iskra*),[234] not knowing what is happening in the world; they have no one to learn from, do not

know how to obtain or to satisfy their desire to engage in broad activities. And I continue to insist that we can *start* establishing *real* contacts only with the aid of a common newspaper, as a single, regular, All-Russian enterprise, which will summarise the results of all the diverse forms of activity and thereby *stimulate* our people to march forward untiringly along *all* the innumerable paths which lead to the revolution in the same way as all roads lead to Rome. If we do not want unity in name only, we must arrange for every local circle *immediately to assign*, say a fourth of its forces to *active* work for the *common* cause, and the newspaper will immediately convey to them * the general design, dimensions and character of this cause, will indicate to them precisely the most serious defects of All-Russian activity, where agitation is lacking and where contacts are weak, and point out which small wheel in the great general mechanism could be repaired or replaced by a better one. A circle that has not commenced to work yet, which is only just seeking work, could then start, not like a craftsman in a small separate workshop unaware of the development that has taken place in "industry," or of the general state of the given industry and the methods of production prevailing in it, but as a participant in an extensive enterprise that *reflects* the whole general revolutionary attack upon the autocracy. And the more perfect the finish of each little wheel will be, the larger the number of detail workers working for the common cause, the closer will our network become and the less consternation will inevitable police raids call forth in the common ranks.

The mere function of distributing a newspaper will help to establish *real* contacts (that is, if it were a newspaper worthy of the name, *i.e.*, if it is issued regularly, not once a month like a big magazine, but four times a month). At the present time, communication between cities on revolutionary business is an extreme rarity, and at all events an exception rather than the rule. If we had a newspaper, however, such communication would become the rule and would secure, not only the distribution of the newspaper, of course, but also (and what is more important) an interchange of

* A *reservation:* that is, if a given circle sympathises with the policy of that newspaper and considers it useful to become a collaborator, meaning by that, not merely a literary collaborator but a revolutionary collaborator generally. *Note for Rabocheye Dyelo:* among the revolutionists who attach value to the cause and not to playing at democracy, who do not separate "sympathy" from active and lively participation, this reservation is taken for granted.

experience, of material, of forces and of resources. The scope of organisational work would immediately become ever so much wider and the success of a single locality would serve as a standing encouragement to further perfection and a desire to utilise the experience gained by comrades working in other parts of the country. Local work would become far richer and more varied than it is now: political and economic exposures gathered from all over Russia would provide mental food to the workers of all trades and in *all stages of development*, would provide material and occasion for talks and readings on the most diverse subjects, which indeed will be suggested by hints in the legal press, by conversations among the public and by shamefaced government communications. Every outbreak, every demonstration, would be weighed and discussed from all its aspects all over Russia; it would stimulate a desire not to lag behind the rest, a desire to excel,—(we Socialists do not by any means reject all rivalry or all "competition!")—and consciously to prepare for that which at first appeared to spring up spontaneously, a desire to take advantage of the favourable conditions in a given district or at a given moment for modifying the plan of attack, etc. At the same time, this revival of local work would render superfluous that convulsive exertion of effort on the part of *all* local workers, working as if in the "throes of death" and the blunt invitation to join put to *every one* willing to perform some service, as is often done to-day when organising every single demonstration or publishing every single number of a local newspaper. In the first place the police would find it much more difficult to dig down to the "roots" because they would not know in what district to seek for them. Secondly, regular common work would train our people to regulate the force of a *given* attack in accordance with the strength of the forces of the given local detachment of the army (at the present time no one ever thinks of doing that because in nine cases out of ten these attacks occur spontaneously), and would facilitate the "transport" from one place to another, not only of literature, but also of revolutionary forces.

In the overwhelming majority of cases, these forces at the present time shed their blood in the cause of restricted local work, but under the circumstances we are discussing, occasion would constantly arise for transferring a capable agitator or organiser from one end of the country to the other. Beginning with short journeys on party business at the party's expense, our people would become accus-

tomed to live at the expense of the party, would become professional revolutionists and would train themselves to become real political leaders.

And if indeed we succeeded in reaching a point when all, or at least a considerable majority of the local committees, local groups and circles actively took up work for the common cause we could, in the not distant future, establish a daily newspaper that would be regularly distributed in tens of thousands of copies over the whole of Russia. This newspaper would become a part of an enormous pair of smith's bellows that would blow every spark of class struggle and popular indignation into a general conflagration. Around what is in itself very innocent and very small, but in the full sense of the word a regular and *common* cause, an army of tried warriors would systematically gather and receive their training. On the ladders and scaffolding of this general organisational structure there would soon ascend Social-Democratic Zhelyabovs from among our revolutionists and Russian Bebels from among our workers who would take their place at the head of the mobilised army and rouse the whole people to settle accounts with the shame and the curse of Russia. That is what we ought to be dreaming about!

"We ought to dream!" I wrote these words and then got scared. It seemed to me that I was sitting at a "unity congress" and that opposite to me were the editors and contributors of *Rabocheye Dyelo*. Comrade Martynov rises and turning to me says threateningly: "Permit me to enquire, has an autonomous editorial board the right to dream without first obtaining permission of the party committee?" He is followed by Comrade Krichevsky who (philosophically deepening the words of Comrade Martynov who had long ago deepened the words of Comrade Plekhanov) continues in the same strain even more threateningly: "I go further. I ask, has a Marxist any right at all to dream, knowing that according to Marx, man always sets himself achievable tasks and that tactics is a process of growth of tasks, which grow together with the party?"

The very thought of these menacing questions sends a cold shiver down my back and makes me wish for nothing except a place to conceal myself in. I will try to conceal myself behind the back of Pisarev.

"There are differences and differences," wrote Pisarev concerning the question of the difference between dreams and reality. "My dream may run ahead

of the natural progress of events or may fly off at a tangent in a direction to which no natural progress of events will ever proceed. In the first case the dream will not cause any harm; it may even support and strengthen the efforts of toiling humanity. There is nothing in such dreams that would distort or paralyse labour power. On the contrary, if man were completely deprived of the ability to dream in this way, if he could never run ahead and mentally conceive in an entire and completed picture the results of the work he is only just commencing, then I cannot imagine what stimulus there would be to induce man to undertake and complete extensive and fatiguing work in the sphere of art, science and practical work. . . . Divergence between dreams and reality causes no harm if only the person dreaming believes seriously in his dream, if he attentively observes life, compares his observations with the airy castles he builds and if, generally speaking, he works conscientiously for the achievement of his fantasies. If there is some connection between dreams and life then all is well." [235]

Now of this kind of dreaming there is unfortunately too little in our movement. And those most responsible for this are the ones who boast of their sober views, their "closeness" to the "concrete," *i. e.*, the representatives of legal criticism and of illegal "khvostism."

C. What Type of Organisation Do We Require?

From what has been said the reader will understand that our "tactics plan" consists in rejecting an immediate *call* for the attack, in demanding "a regular siege of the enemy fortress," or in other words, in demanding that all efforts be directed towards rallying, organising and *mobilising* permanent troops. When we ridiculed *Rabocheye Dyelo* for its leap from Economism to shouting for an attack (in *Listok Rabochevo Dyela,* No. 6, April, 1901) it of course hurled accusations against us of being "doctrinaire," of failing to understand our revolutionary duty, of calling for caution, etc. Of course we were not surprised to hear these accusations coming from those who totally lack balance and who evade all arguments by references to a profound "tactics-process," any more than we were surprised by the fact that these accusations were repeated by Nadezhdin who has a supreme contempt for durable programmes and tactical bases.

It is said that history never repeats itself. But Nadezhdin is exerting every effort to cause it to repeat itself and zealously imitates Tkachev in strongly condemning "revolutionary culturism," in shouting about "sounding the tocsin" about a special "eve of the revolution point-of-view," etc. Apparently, he has forgotten the well-known epigram which says: If an original historical event

represents a tragedy, the copy of it is only a farce.[236] The attempt to seize power, after the ground for the attempt had been prepared by the preaching of Tkachev and carried out by means of the "terrifying" terror which did really terrify was majestic, but the "excitative" terror of a little Tkachev is simply ridiculous and is particularly ridiculous when it is supplemented by the idea of an organisation of average workers.

"If *Iskra* would only emerge from its sphere of literariness," wrote Nadezhdin, "it would realise that these [the working man's letter to *Iskra* No. 7, etc.] are symptoms of the fact that soon, very soon the 'attack' will commence, and to talk now [*sic!*] about organisations linked up with an All-Russian newspaper is simply to give utterance to armchair thoughts and to do armchair work." What unimaginable confusion this is: on the one hand excitative terror and an "organisation of average workers" accompanied by the opinion that it is "much easier" to gather around something "more concrete" like a local newspaper,—and on the other hand, to talk "now" about an All-Russian organisation means to give utterance to armchair thoughts, or, to speak more frankly and simply, "Now" is already too late! But what about "the extensive organisation of local newspapers,"—is it not too late for that my dear L. Nadezhdin? And compare this with *Iskra's* point-of-view and tactics: excitative terror—is nonsense; to talk about an organisation of average workers and about the *extensive* organisation of local newspapers means to open the door wide for Economism. We must speak about a single All-Russian organisation of revolutionists and it will never be too late to talk about that until the real, and not the paper attack, commences.

> Yes, as far as our situation in regard to organisation is concerned, it is far from brilliant, continues Nadezhin. Yes, *Iskra* is absolutely right when it says that the mass of our military forces consist of volunteers and insurgents. . . . You do very well in thus soberly presenting the state of our forces. But why in doing so do you forget that *the crowd is not ours* and, consequently, *it will not ask us* when to commence military operations, it will simply go and "rebel." . . . When the crowd itself breaks out with its elemental destructive force it *may* overwhelm and crush the "regular troops" to which all may have rallied but which had *not managed* in time to establish itself as an extremely systematic organisation. [Our italics.]

Astonishing logic! *Precisely because* the "crowd is not ours," it is stupid and reprehensible to call for an "attack" this very minute, because an attack must be made by permanent troops and not

by a spontaneous outburst of the crowd. It is precisely because the crowd *may* overwhelm and crush permanent troops that we must without fail "manage" to keep up with the spontaneous rise of the masses in our work of "establishing an extremely systematic organisation" among the permanent troops, for the more we "manage" to establish such an organisation the more probable will it be that the permanent troops will not be overwhelmed by the crowd, but will take their place at the head of the crowd. Nadezhdin drops into confusion because he imagines that these systematically organised troops are engaged in something that isolates them from the crowd, when as a matter of fact they are engaged exclusively in all-sided and all-embracing political agitation, *i. e.*, precisely in work that *brings them into closer proximity and merges* the elemental destructive force of the crowd with the conscious destructive force of the organisation of revolutionists. You gentlemen merely wish to throw the blame for your sins on the shoulders of others. For it is precisely the *Svoboda* group that includes terror in its *programme* and by that calls for an organisation of terrorists, and such an organisation would really prevent our troops from coming into proximity with the crowd which, unfortunately, is still not ours, and which unfortunately, does not yet ask us, or rarely asks us when and how to commence military operations.

"We will overlook the revolution itself," continues Nadezhdin in his effort to scare *Iskra*, "in the same way as we overlooked recent events which hurled themselves upon us like a bolt from the blue." This sentence together with the one quoted above clearly demonstrates the absurdity of the "eve of the revolution point-of-view" invented by *Svoboda.** To speak frankly, this special point-of-view" amounts to this that it is too late "now" to discuss and prepare. If that is the case, oh most worthy opponent of "literariness," what was the use of writing a pamphlet of 132 pages on "Questions of Theory and Tactics"? ** Don't you think that it

* "The Eve of the Revolution," p. 62.

** In his *Review of Questions of Theory*, L. Nadezhdin made almost no contribution whatever to the discussion of questions of theory apart perhaps from the following passage which appears to be a very peculiar one from the "eve of the revolution point-of-view": "Bernsteinism, on the whole, is losing its acuteness for us at the present moment, as also is the question as to whether Mr. Adamovich has proved that Mr. Struve has already deserved dismissal or on the contrary whether Mr. Struve will refute Mr. Adamovich and will refuse to resign—it really makes no difference, because the bour of the revolution has struck" [p. 110]. One can hardly imagine a more striking

would have been more becoming for the "eve of the revolution point-of-view" to have issued 132,000 leaflets containing the brief appeal: "Kill them!"?

Those who place national political agitation at the corner stone of their programme, *their tactics and their organisational work* as *Iskra* does, stand the least risk of overlooking the revolution. The people who were engaged over the whole of Russia in weaving a network of organisations to be linked up with an All-Russian newspaper not only did not overlook the spring events, but on the contrary, they enabled us to foretell them. Nor did they overlook the demonstrations that were described in *Iskra*, Nos. 13 and 14[237]: on the contrary, they took part in those demonstrations, clearly appreciating their duty to come to the aid of the spontaneously rising crowd and while rendering aid, at the same time, through the medium of the newspaper, to make closer acquaintance with these demonstrations and to place their experience at the disposal of all Russian comrades. And if they live they will not overlook the revolution which first and foremost will demand of us experience in agitation, ability to support (in a Social-Democratic manner) every protest and ability to direct the spontaneous movements, and to guard them from the mistakes of friends and the traps of enemies!

This brings us to the final argument that compels us to insist particularly upon a plan of organisation that shall be centred around an All-Russian newspaper to be brought about by means of joint work for the establishment of a common newspaper. Only such an organisation will secure *flexibility* necessary for the Social-Democratic militant organisation, *i. e.*, an ability to adapt itself immediately to the most diverse and rapidly changing conditions of struggle, an ability to "renounce an open fight against overwhelming and concentrated forces, and yet capable of taking advantage of the awkwardness and immobility of the enemy and attack at a time and place where he least expects attack." * It would be a

illustration of L. Nadezhdin's infinite disregard for theory. We have proclaimed "the eve of the revolution"—*therefore* "it really makes no difference" whether the orthodox Marxists will succeed in driving the critics from their positions or not!! And our wiseacre fails to see that it is precisely in the time of revolution that we stand in need of the results of our theoretical combats with the critics in order to be able resolutely to combat their *practical* positions!

* *Iskra*, No. 4, "Where to Begin." "Revolutionary culturists who do not accept the eve of the revolution point-of-view, are not in the least disturbed by the prospect of working for a long period of time," writes Nadezhdin

grievous error indeed to build up the party organisation in the expectation only of outbreaks and street fighting, or only upon the "forward march of the drab, every-day struggle." We must *always* carry on our every-day work and always be prepared for everything, because very frequently, it is almost impossible to foresee beforehand when periods of outbreaks will give way to periods of calm. And even in those cases when it is possible to do so, it will not be possible to utilise this foresight for the purpose of reconstructing our organisation, because in an autocratic country these changes from turmoil to calm take place with astonishing rapidity and are sometimes due merely to a single night raid by the tsarist janizaries. And the revolution itself must not by any means be regarded as a single act (as Nadezhdin apparently imagines) but as a series of more or less powerful outbreaks rapidly alternating with more or less intense calm. For that reason, the principal content of the activity of our party organisation, the "trick" of this activity should be, to carry on work that is possible and necessary both in the period of the most powerful outbreaks as well as in periods of complete calm, that is to say: work of political agitation linked up over the whole of Russia, that will enlighten all aspects of life and will be carried on among the broadest possible strata of the masses. But this work *cannot possibly be carried on* in contemporary Russia without an All-Russian newspaper, issued very frequently. An organisation that is built up around this newspaper, an organisation of *collaborators* of this paper (collaborators in the broad sense of the word, *i. e.*, all those working for it) will be ready *for everything*, from protecting the honour, the prestige, and continuity of the party in periods of acute revolutionary "depression" to preparing for, commencing and carrying out the *national armed insurrection.*

Indeed, picture to yourselves a very ordinary occurrence with us,

[p. 62]. On this we shall observe: unless we are able to devise political tactics and an organisational plan based precisely upon calculations for *work over a long period of time* and at the same time, *in the very process of this work*, put our party into readiness to spring to its post and fulfil its duty at the very first, even unexpected, call, as soon as the progress of events becomes accelerated, we will prove to be but miserable political adventurers. Only Nadezhdin, who only yesterday began to describe himself as a Social-Democrat, can forget that the aim of Social-Democracy is radically to transform the conditions of life of the whole of humanity and that for that reason it is not permissible for Social-Democrats to be "disturbed" by the question of the duration of the work.

—the complete discovery and arrest of our organisations in one or several localities. In view of the fact that *all* the local organisations lack *a single*, common regular task, such raids frequently result in the interruption of our work for many months. If, however, all the local organisations had one common task, then, in the event of a serious raid, two or three energetic persons could in the course of a few weeks establish new youth circles, which, as is well known, spring up very quickly even now, and link them up with the centre, and when this common task, which has been interrupted by the raid, is apparent to all, the new circles could spring up and link themselves up with it even more rapidly.

On the other hand, picture to yourselves a popular uprising. Probably every one will now agree that we must think of this uprising and prepare for it. But *how* to prepare for it? Surely the Central Committee cannot appoint agents to go to all the districts for the purpose of preparing for the uprising! Even if we had a Central Committee it could achieve nothing by making such appointments considering the conditions prevailing in contemporary Russia. On the contrary, a network of agents * that would automatically be created in the course of establishing and distributing a common newspaper would not have to "sit around and wait" for the call to rebellion, but would carry on the regular work that would guarantee the highest probability of success in the event of a rebellion. Such work would strengthen our contacts with the broadest strata of the masses of the workers and with all those strata who are discontented with the autocracy and who are so important to have in the event of an uprising. It is precisely such work that would help to cultivate the ability properly to estimate the general political situation and consequently, the ability to select the proper moment for the uprising. It is precisely such work that would train *all* local organisations to respond simultaneously to the same political

* Alas, alas! Again I have let slip that awful word "agents" which jars so awfully on the democratic ears of Martynov! I wonder why this word did not offend the sensibilities of the heroes of the seventies and yet offends the amateurs of the nineties? I like the word, because it clearly and distinctly indicates the *common cause* to which all the agents bend their thoughts and actions and if I had to replace this word by another, the only word I would select would be the word "collaborator" if it did not suggest literariness and diffusiveness. The thing we need is a militant organisation of agents. The numerous (particularly abroad) Martynovs whose favourite pastime is "playing at generals" may instead of saying "passport agent" prefer to say, "Chief of the Special Department for Supplying Revolutionists with Passports," etc.

questions, incidents and events that excite the whole of Russia, to react to these "events" in the most vigorous, uniform and expedient manner possible; for is not rebellion in essence the most vigorous, most uniform and most expedient "reaction" of the whole people to the conduct of the government? And finally, such work would train all revolutionary organisations all over Russia to maintain the most continuous and at the same time the most secret contact with each other, which will create *real* Party unity,—for without such contacts it will be impossible collectively to discuss the plan of rebellion and to take the necessary preparatory measures on the eve of it, which must be kept in the strictest secrecy.

In a word, the "plan for an All-Russian political newspaper" does not represent the fruits of the work of armchair workers, infected with dogmatism and literariness (as it seemed to those who failed to study it properly), on the contrary it is a practical plan to commence immediately to prepare on all sides for the uprising, while at the same time never for a moment forgetting the ordinary, every-day work.

CONCLUSION

THE history of Russian Social-Democracy can be divided into three distinct periods:

The first period covers about ten years, approximately the years 1884 to 1894. This was the period when the theory and the programme of Social-Democracy germinated and took root. The number of adherents to the new tendency in Russia could be counted in units. Social-Democracy existed without a labour movement; it was, as it were, in its period of gestation.

The second period covers three or four years—1894-1898. In this period Social-Democracy appeared in the world as a social movement, as the rising of the masses of the people, as a political party. This is the period of its infancy and adolescence. Social-Democratic ideas spread among the intelligentsia like an epidemic and they became entirely absorbed in the fight against Populism, in going among the workers, and the latter, in their turn, were entirely absorbed in fomenting strikes. The movement made enormous strides. The majority of the leaders were very young people who had by no means reached the "age of thirty-five," which to N. Mikhailovsky appears to be a sort of natural borderline. Owing to their youth, they proved to be untrained for practical work and they left the scene with astonishing rapidity. But in the majority of cases the scope of their work was extremely wide. Many of them began their revolutionary thinking as Narodovolists. Nearly all of them in their early youth enthusiastically worshipped the terrorist heroes. It was a great wrench to abandon the captivating impressions of these heroic traditions and it was accompanied by the breaking off of personal relationships with people who were determined to remain loyal to *Narodnaya Volya* and for whom the young Social-Democrats had profound respect. The struggle compelled them to educate themselves, to read the illegal literature of all tendencies and to study closely the questions of legal Populism. Trained in this struggle, Social-Democrats went into the labour movement without "for a moment" forgetting the theories of Marxism which illumined their path or the task of overthrowing the autocracy. The formation of the party in the spring of 1898 was the most striking

and at the same time the *last* act of the Social-Democrats in this period.

The third period, as we have seen, began in 1897 and definitely replaced the second period in 1898 (1898—?). This was the period of confusion, disintegration, and vacillation. In the period of adolescence the youth's voice breaks. The voice of Russian Social-Democracy in this period began to break, began to strike a false note—on the one hand, in the productions of Messrs. Struve and Prokopovich, Bulgakov and Berdyaev, on the other hand in the productions of V. I-na and R. M., B. Krichevsky and Martynov. But it was only the leaders who wandered from the path; the movement itself continued to grow and advanced by enormous strides. The proletarian struggle spread to new strata of the workers over the whole of Russia and at the same time indirectly stimulated the revival of the democratic spirit among the students and among other strata of the population. The consciousness of the leaders, however, shrank before the breadth and power of the spontaneous rising; among Social-Democrats, a different streak predominated—a streak of party workers who had been trained almost exclusively on "legal" Marxian literature, and the more the spontaneity of the masses called for consciousness, the more they lacked consciousness. The leaders not only lagged behind in regard to theory ("freedom of criticism") and practice ("primitiveness") but even tried to justify their backwardness by all sorts of high-flown arguments. Social-Democracy was degraded to the level of trade unionism in legal literature by the Brentanoists and in illegal literature by the Khvostists. The programme of the *Credo* began to be put into operation, especially when the "primitiveness" of the Social-Democrats caused a revival of non-Social-Democratic revolutionary tendencies.

And if the reader reproaches me for having dealt in excessive detail with *Rabocheye Dyelo,* I will say to him in reply: *Rabocheye Dyelo* acquired "historical" significance because it most strikingly reflected the "spirit" of this third period.* It was not the consistent R. M. but the weathercock Krichevskys and Martynovs who could properly express the confusion and vacillation, and the readiness to

* I could also reply in the German proverb: *Den Sack schlägt man, den Esel meint man.* It was not *Rabocheye Dyelo* alone that was carried away by the fashion of "criticism" but also *the masses of practical workers and theoreticians;* they became confused over the question of spontaneity and slipped from the Social-Democratic to the trade-union conception of our political and organisational tasks.

make concessions to "criticism," to Economism and to terrorism. It is not the lofty contempt for practical work displayed by the worshippers of the "absolute" that is characteristic of this period, but the combination of pettifogging practice and utter disregard for theory. It was not so much the downright rejection of "grand phrases" that the heroes of this period engaged in as in their vulgarisation: Scientific Socialism ceased to be a complete revolutionary theory and became a petty-bourgeois idea "freely" diluted with the contents of every new German textbook that appeared; the slogan "class struggle" did not impel them forward to wider and more strenuous activity but served as a soothing syrup, because (*sic!*) the "economic struggle is inseparably linked up with the political struggle"; the idea of a party did not serve as a call for the creation of a militant organisation of revolutionists, but was used to justify some sort of a "revolutionary bureaucracy" and infantile playing at "democracy."

When this third period will come to an end and the fourth period will commence, we do not know (at all events it is already heralded by many symptoms). Just now we are passing from the sphere of history into the sphere of the present and partly into the sphere of the future. But we firmly believe that the fourth period will see the consolidation of militant Marxism, that Russian Social-Democracy will emerge from the crisis in the full strength of manhood, that a "new guard" will arise, that instead of the present rear-guard of opportunists, we will have a genuine vanguard of the most revolutionary class.

In the sense of calling for such a "new guard" and summing up as it were all that has been expounded above, my reply to the question: "What is to be done?" can be put briefly: Liquidate the Third Period.

APPENDIX

THE ATTEMPT TO UNITE *ISKRA* WITH *RABOCHEYE DYELO*

It remains for us to describe the organisational tactics *Iskra* adopted towards *Rabocheye Dyelo.* These tactics have been already fully expressed in *Iskra*, No. 1, in an article entitled "The Split in the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad." * From the outset we adopted the point-of-view that the *real* League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, which at the first congress of our party was recognised as the party's representative abroad, had *split* into two organisations;—that the question of the party's representation remains an open one and that the settlement reached at the International Congress at Paris by the election of two members to represent Russia on the International Socialist Bureau, one from each of the two sections of the divided League, was only a temporary and conditional settlement. We declared that on essentials *Rabocheye Dyelo was wrong;* in principle we emphatically took the side of the Emancipation of Labour group, but at the same time we refused to enter into the details of the split and noted the services rendered by the League in the sphere of purely practical work.**

Consequently, ours was, to a certain extent, a waiting policy; we made a concession to the opinion prevailing among the majority of the Russian Social-Democrats that the most determined opponents of Economism could work hand in hand with the "League" because, it was said, the "League" has frequently declared its agreement in principle with the Emancipation of Labour group and that it did not claim an independent position on fundamental questions of theory and tactics. The correctness of the position we took up has been proved indirectly by the fact that almost simultaneously with the publication of the first number of *Iskra* [December, 1900] three members separated from the League and formed the so-called "Group of Initiators" [238] and offered their services: 1. To the foreign section of the *Iskra* organisation; 2. To the Revolutionary Social-

* See article of the same title, p. 65, Book I of this volume.—*Ed.*

** Our opinion of the split was based not only upon a perusal of the literature on the subject but also on information gathered by several members of our organisation who had been abroad.

Democrat Organisation; and 3. To the "League" as mediators in negotiations for reconciliation. It is true that when a speaker related these facts at the "Unity" Congress last year, a member of the Management Committee of the "League" declared that their rejection of the offer was due *entirely* to the fact that the League was dissatisfied with the composition of the Initiators' group. While I consider it my duty to quote this explanation I cannot, however, refrain from observing that the explanation is an unsatisfactory one; knowing that two organisations had agreed to enter into negotiations, the "League" could have approached them through other intermediaries, or directly.

In the spring of 1901 both *Zarya* [No. 1, April] and *Iskra* [No. 4, May] entered into open polemics with *Rabocheye Dyelo.*[239] *Iskra* particularly attacked the "historical turn" taken by *Rabocheye Dyelo* which, in its *April* supplement, and consequently after the spring events, revealed instability in regard to terror, and the calls for "blood," with which many had been carried away at the time. Notwithstanding these polemics, the "League" agreed to the resumption of negotiations for reconciliation through the mediation of a new group of "conciliators."[240] A preliminary conference of representatives of the three organisations named above took place in June at which a draft agreement was drawn up on the basis of a detailed "agreement on principles" that was published by the "League" in the pamphlet *Two Congresses* and by the League in the pamphlet entitled *Documents of the Unity Congress.**

The contents of this agreement on principles (or as it is more frequently named, the Resolutions of the June Conference), clearly shows that we put forward as an absolute condition for unity *the most emphatic* repudiation of all manifestations of opportunism generally and of Russian opportunism in particular. Paragraph 1 reads: "We repudiate every attempt to introduce opportunism into the proletarian class struggle—attempts which are expressed in so-called Economism, Bernsteinism, Millerandism, etc." "The sphere of Social-Democratic activities include . . . intellectual struggle against all opponents of revolutionary Marxism" [4, C]; "In every

* The "League," in quotation marks, is the section of the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad that supported *Rabocheye Dyelo*, and the League, without quotation marks, is that section which supported *Iskra*. In the Russian text the former is described as the "Soyus," which means League, and the latter as "Liga," and in this way the two sections were distinguished from one another.—*Ed.*

sphere of organisational and agitational activity Social-Democracy must not for a moment forget that the immediate task of the Russian proletariat is—to overthrow the autocracy" [5, A]; " . . . agitation, not only on the basis of the every-day struggle between wage labour and capital" [5, B]; " . . . not recognising . . . stages of purely economic struggles and of struggles for partial political demands" [5, C]; ". . . we consider important for the movement criticism of the tendency which elevates primitiveness . . . and restrictedness of the lower forms of the movement into a principle" [5, C-D]. Even a complete outsider, who has read these resolutions at all attentively, will have realised from the very way in which they are formulated that they are directed against those who are opportunists and Economists, against those who, even for a moment, forget about the task of overthrowing the autocracy, who recognise the theory of stages, who have elevated narrowness to a principle, etc. And any one who has any acquaintance at all with the polemics conducted by the Emancipation of Labour group, *Zarya* and *Iskra* against *Rabocheye Dyelo,* cannot but be convinced that these resolutions repudiate point by point the very errors into which *Rabocheye Dyelo* had wandered. Consequently, when one of the members of the "League" declared at the "Unity" Congress that the articles in No. 10 of *Rabocheye Dyelo* were prompted, not by a new "historical turn" on the part of the "League," but by the fact that the resolutions were too "abstract," * this assertion was quite justly ridiculed by one of the speakers. The resolutions are not abstract in the least, he said, they are incredibly concrete: a single glance at them is sufficient to see that there is a "catch" in this.

The latter remark served as the occasion for a characteristic episode at the congress. On the one hand, B. Krichevsky seized upon the word "catch" in the belief that this was a slip of the tongue which betrayed our evil intentions ("To set a trap") and pathetically exclaimed: "A catch, for whom?" "Yes, indeed, for whom?"—Plekhanov rejoined sarcastically. "I will stimulate Comrade Plekhanov's perspicacity," replied B. Krichevsky, "I will explain to him that the trap was set *for the editorial board of Rabocheye Dyelo* (general laughter), "but we have not allowed ourselves to be caught!" (A remark from the left: all the worse for you!) On the other hand, a member of the Borba group (the conciliators), in opposing the "League's" amendment to the resolution and wishing

* This expression is repeated in *Two Congresses,* p. 25.

to defend our speaker, declared that obviously the word "catch" was dropped in the heat of polemics.

For my part, I think the speaker responsible for uttering the word under discussion was not at all pleased with this "defence." I think the word "catch" was a "true word spoken in jest": We have always accused *Rabocheye Dyelo* of instability and vacillation and, naturally, we *had* to try to *catch* it in order to put a stop to this vacillation. There is not the slightest suggestion of evil intent in this, for we were discussing instability of principles. And we succeeded in "catching" the "League" in such a comradely manner * that B. Krichevsky himself and one other member of the Managing Committee of the "League" signed the June resolutions.

The articles in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10 (our comrades saw this number for the first time when they arrived at the congress, a few days before the meetings started), clearly showed that the "League" had taken a new turn in the period between the summer and the autumn: the Economists had again got the upper hand on the editorial board, which turned with every "wind," and the board again defended "the most pronounced Bernsteinists," "freedom of criticism" and "spontaneity," and through the mouth of Martynov began to preach the "theory of restricting" the sphere of our political influence (for the alleged purpose of making this influence more complex). Once again Parvus' apt observation that it was difficult to catch an opportunist with a formula was proved correct. An opportunist will put his name to *any* formula and as readily abandon it, because opportunism is precisely a lack of definite and firm principles. To-day, the opportunists have repudiated *all* attempts to introduce opportunism, repudiated *all* narrowness, solemnly promised "never for a moment to forget about the task of overthrowing the autocracy," to carry on "agitation not only on the

* Precisely: In the introduction to the June resolutions we said that Russian Social-Democracy as a whole always took its stand on the basis of the principles of the Emancipation of Labour group and that the "League's" merit lay particularly in its publishing and organising activity. In other words, we expressed our complete readiness to forget the past and to recognise the usefulness (for the cause) of the work of our comrades of the "League" *on the condition* that it completely ceased the vacillation which we tried to "catch." Any impartial person reading the June resolutions will so interpret them. If, now the "League" after having *caused* a split by its new turn towards Economism (in its articles in No. 10 and in the amendments), solemnly accuses us of *prevaricating* [*Two Congresses*, p. 30] because of what we said about its merits, then, of course, such an accusation can only raise a smile.

basis of the every-day struggle between wage labour and capital," etc., etc. But to-morrow they will change their form of expression and revert to their old tricks on the pretext of defending spontaneity and the forward march of the drab every-day struggle, of proclaiming demands promising palpable results, etc. By asserting that in the articles in No. 10 "the League did not and does not now see any heretical departure from the general principles of the draft adopted at the conference" [*Two Congresses*, p. 26], the "League" reveals a complete lack of ability, or a lack of desire, to understand the essential points of the disagreements.

After the appearance of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10, only one thing remained for us to do and that was to open a general discussion in order to ascertain whether all the members of the "League" agree with these articles and with its editorial board. The "League" is particularly displeased with us because of this and accuses us of sowing discord in the "League," of not minding our own business, etc. These accusations are obviously unfounded because with an elected board which "turns" with every breeze, everything depends precisely upon the direction of the wind, and we defined the direction of the wind at private meetings at which no one, except members of the organisations who had gathered together for the purpose of uniting, were present. The amendments to the June resolutions submitted in the name of the "League" have removed the last shadow of a hope of an agreement. The amendments are documentary evidence of the new turn towards Economism and of the fact that the majority of the members of the "League" are in agreement with *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 10. Amendments were moved to delete the words "so-called Economism" from the reference in the resolution to manifestations of opportunism (on the pretext that "the sense" of these three words "was vague"—but if that were so, all that was required was a more precise definition of the nature of a widespread error), and to delete "Millerandism" (although B. Krichevsky defended it in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, Nos. 2 and 3, pp. 83-84, and still more openly in the *Vorwärts*).* Notwithstanding the fact that the June resolutions definitely indicated the tasks of Social-Democracy, *viz.*, "to guide *every* manifestation of the proletarian struggle against *all* forms of political, *economic* and social oppres-

* A controversy over this subject had started in the *Vorwärts* between its present editor, Kautsky, and the editorial board of *Zarya*. We shall not fail to acquaint the reader with the nature of this controversy.[241]

sion," and by that called for the introduction of system and unity in all these manifestations of the struggle, the "League" added the absolutely superfluous sentence to the effect that "the economic struggle is a powerful stimulus to the mass movement" (taken by itself, this assertion cannot be disputed, but in view of the existence of narrow Economism it cannot but give occasion for false interpretations). More than that, the *restriction* of "politics" was introduced into the June resolution by the deletion of the words "not for a moment" (forget the aim of overthrowing the autocracy) as well as by the addition of the words "the economic struggle is the *most widely* applicable means of drawing the masses into active political struggle. It is quite understandable that after such amendments had been introduced all the speakers on our side should one after another refuse to take the floor on the ground that further negotiations with people who were again turning towards Economism and who were striving to secure for themselves freedom of vacillation were useless.

"It was precisely the fact that the League regarded the preservation of the independent features and the autonomy of *Rabocheye Dyelo* as the *sine qua non* of the durability of our future agreement, that *Iskra* regarded as the rock upon which our agreement fell to pieces" [*Two Congresses*, p. 25]. This is very inexact. We never had any designs against *Rabocheye Dyelo's* autonomy.* We did indeed *absolutely refuse to recognise* the independence of its features, if by "independent features" is meant independence on questions of principle regarding theory and practice: The June resolutions did indeed absolutely repudiate *such* independence of features because, in practice, such "independent features" meant, as we have said already, vacillation and support for the vacillations that now prevail among us, and the intolerable confusion that reigns in party affairs. *Rabocheye Dyelo's* articles in its issue No. 10, and its "amendments" clearly revealed its desire to preserve precisely this kind of independence of features, and such a desire naturally and inevitably led to a rupture and a declaration of war. But we were all ready to recognise *Rabocheye Dyelo's* "independent features" in the sense that it should concentrate on definite literary functions. A proper distribution of functions naturally called for: (1) A scien-

* That is if the editorial consultations that were proposed in connection with the establishment of a joint supreme council of the combined organisations are not to be regarded as a restriction of autonomy. But in June *Rabocheye Dyelo* agreed to this.

tific magazine, (2) a political newspaper, and (3) a popular symposium of articles and popular pamphlets. Only by agreeing to such a distribution of functions would *Rabocheye Dyelo* have proved that it *sincerely* desired to abandon once and for all its erring ways against which the June resolutions were directed. Only such a distribution of functions would have removed all possibility of friction and would have guaranteed a durable agreement which would at the same time have served as a basis for a fresh revival and new successes of our movement.

Not a single Russian Social-Democrat can have any doubts now about the fact that the final rupture between the revolutionary and opportunist tendencies was brought about, not by any "organisational" circumstances, but by the desire of the opportunists to perpetuate the independent features of opportunism and to continue to cause confusion of mind by the arguments like those advanced by the Krichevskys and Martynovs.

CORRECTION TO *WHAT IS TO BE DONE*[242]

THE Group of Initiators, to whom I referred in the pamphlet *What Is To Be Done?*,* have asked me to make the following correction to my description of the part they played in the attempt to reconcile the Social-Democratic organisations abroad:

Of the three members of this group only one left the "League" at the end of 1900; the others left in 1901, only after they had become convinced that it was impossible to obtain the "League's" consent to a conference with the foreign organisations of *Iskra* and the Revolutionary Social-Democrat Organisation, which is what the Group of Initiators had proposed. First of all, the Managing Committee of the "League" rejected the proposal for a conference on the ground that the persons making up the Group of Initiators were not "competent" to act as mediators and for that reason it at that time expressed the desire to enter into direct contact with the *Iskra* organisation abroad. Soon after, however, the Managing Committee of the "League" informed the Group of Initiators that after the appearance of the first number of *Iskra*, containing the report of the split in the "League," it had altered its decision and no longer desired to have communication with *Iskra*. After this, how can one explain the statement made by a member of the Managing Committee of the "League" that the "League's" rejection of a conference was called forth *entirely* by its dissatisfaction with the composition of the Group of Initiators? It is true that it is equally difficult to explain why the Managing Committee of the "League" agreed to a conference in June last; for the remarks contained in the first issue of *Iskra* still remained in force and *Iskra's* "hostility" to the "League" was still more strongly expressed in the first volume of *Zarya* and in No. 4 of *Iskra*, both of which appeared prior to the June conference.

Iskra, No. 18, April 1, 1902.

* See page 251 of this Book.—*Ed.*

APPENDICES

EXPLANATORY NOTES

115. This passage is taken from the article in *Iskra*, No. 6 for July, 1901, entitled "Famine is Coming."—p. 13.

116. Lenin apparently did not have the copies of the *Iskra* before him when referring to the correspondence from the provinces and apparently quoted Nos. 6 and 7 from memory. The fact is that the first ten numbers of *Iskra* contain no correspondence from Penza. No. 7 of *Iskra* contains correspondence from Simferopol about the May Day demonstrations, and No. 8 contains correspondence from Kursk about the distribution of manifestoes after the March events in St. Petersburg and the ferment among the students and peasants.—p. 20.

117. The phraseology used in Saltykov-Shchedrin's *The History of a Certain City*.—p. 22.

118. An interview with A. P. Engelhardt, Governor of Saratov, published in *Novoye Vremya*, October 9, 1901.—p. 22.

119. A leading article in *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* of September 19, 1901, bearing the title "The New Circular on Public Works."—p. 23.

120. A report submitted by the Saratov Zemstvo Administration to the special Session of the Provincial Council a summarised report of which was published in the *Saratov Vestnik* of August 29, 1901 under the heading "Cattle Fodder in the Famine Area." The report is published in full in a supplement to the same journal dated August 31. For the purpose of this article, Lenin utilised both sources. The passages quoted in the article are not quoted textually but are brief paraphrases of the text.—p. 24.

121. A communication "From the County Administration Department of the Ministry of the Interior—September 12, 1901," published in the *Official Gazette*, No. 203 (September 29) and also in *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, September 21 and 23.—p. 24.

122. A newspaper published in Rostov-on-Don in 1891 by S. H. Artyunov. —p. 25.

123. This passage is taken from an article published in *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, September 13, 1901, "Lack of Publicity."—p. 26.

124. Lenin here has in mind *An Outline of Our Post Reform Public Economy* by Nikolai-on (N. F. Danielson) published in 1893.—p. 36.

125. The correspondence from which Lenin quotes here was published in *Russkiye Vyedomosti* of September 4, 1901, under the title of "The Buguruslan County."—p. 37.

126. Reference is made here to the article "More Progress in Russia's Trade with Prussia," published in *Novoye Vremya*, October 2, 1901.—p. 38.

127. Kondoidi's speech was published in the *Samaraskaya Gazeta*, January 13, 1900 under the heading "Speech by Mr. Administrator of the Province delivered on January 11 at the Opening of the Ordinary Session of the Provincial Zemstvo Assembly."—p. 39.

128. This passage is quoted from an article published in *Iskra*, May 4, 1901, "Yaroslavl."—p. 43.

129. The leading article in *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, September 29, 1901, had the following heading: "A Deplorably Memorable Speech." The extracts from the speech delivered by M. A. Stakhovich, quoted by Lenin, are taken from the *Oryol Vestnik*, No. 254.—p. 47.

130. A. Suvorin's appreciation of M. A. Stakhovich is quoted from his *Minor Letters*, CDXIX, published in *Novoye Vremya*, October 5, 1901.—p. 48.

131. A journal published in 1896 by the ecclesiastical authorities in Kiev to combat the non-conformist sects. Edited by V. M. Skvortsov.—p. 48.

132. A social, political and literary magazine which commenced publication in 1876.—p. 49.

133. A theological and philosophical magazine, founded and directed by Ambrosius, Bishop of Kharkov. Grouping around itself the most reactionary representatives of the church and of theology, the journal carried on a systematic struggle against "modern errors and vices" and against the "plague of modern false doctrines" in which category it included Liberalism, materialism, Tolstoyism, etc.

I. Preobrazhensky's letter which Lenin quotes was obviously published in *Vera i Razum* by an oversight on the part of the editor. The belated excuse offered by the editor was that he published Preobrazhensky's letter together with a letter from a certain V. Mitrofanov, "an orthodox and pious Russian," under the common heading of: "Two Characteristic Letters Addressed to His Venerable Grace, Ambrosius, Bishop of Kharkov, one from a Good Christian and the other from a Learned Liberal" in order to show the "two camps" in modern society. (*Vera i Razum*, No. 8, 1901.) This explanation was followed by an article in a subsequent issue full of vituperation against Preobrazhensky.—p. 51.

134. Turgenev's reference to Leo Tolstoy.—p. 51.

135. A Tolstoyan journal published in England from 1901 to 1905 under the editorship of V. Chertkov. Simultaneously with *Svobodnoye Slovo* the Tolstoyans also published *Svobodnoye Slovo* leaflets, the works of Tolstoy and pamphlets dealing particularly with the Russian government's persecution of the non-conformist sects.—p. 51.

136. The identity of this marshal of the nobility has not been established, nor has a copy of the speech referred to been discovered.—p. 52.

137. Lenin's views concerning the attitude of revolutionary Social-Democrats towards the Liberal bourgeoisie expressed in the foregoing articles and especially the concluding sentences of this article roused the hostility of the anti-*Iskra* elements who attacked *Iskra* and Lenin for their alleged opportunism concealed under a mask of orthodoxy.—p. 57.

138. The so-called "Unity" Congress was convened for the purpose of attempting to lay down a basis of unity for the various groups into which the Russian Social-Democratic movement was at that time split up.—p. 58.

139. Published by a group of Social-Democrats which had considerable influence in the industrial districts in the South of Russia. This group did not share *Iskra's* views regarding the centralised form of party organisation and strove to preserve its independence. However, the group dissolved in obedience to the decision of the second congress which ordered the dissolution of all independent groups and organisations.—p. 65.

140. The policy conducted from 1901 to 1903 by Zubatov, the chief of the Moscow Secret Service with the support of Plehve, the Minister of the Interior, towards the labour movement of that time. In accordance with these tactics, Zubatov himself initiated legal labour organisations for the purpose of side-tracking the revolutionary political struggle. These police-protected unions at first pretended to carry on a vigorous fight against the capitalists, for the tsarist government hoped by concentrating the minds of the workers on industrial grievances, to keep their minds off their political grievances. Meanwhile, the police exerted every effort to crush the revolutionary organisations and to eradicate their influence among the workers. These police unions, however, were unable to restrain the tide of the revolutionary movement and were swept away by the great strike wave of 1903. The tsarist government, of course, did not return to this dangerous experiment, but something of a similar nature was attempted in 1905 by the priest Gapon.—p. 65.

141. The authors of this letter had in mind an article by H. Martov entitled "The New Friends of the Russian Proletariat" published in *Iskra,* No. 1, December, 1900. Martov dedicated this article in which he described the methods adopted by Zubatov's agents to combat the revolutionary movement among the Jewish workers in Western Russia, to *Rabochaya Mysl* which roused the indignation of the Economists.—p. 65.

142. Adherents of the Marxist Jules Guesde, the leader of the Left Wing in the French Socialist movement. Guesde, however, became a chauvinist during the World War.—p. 66.

143. *Rabocheye Dyelo* vacillated a great deal on the question of the Social-Democratic attitude towards terror. In one of its issues, it described the question of terror as an "absolutely new one" for Social-Democracy, notwithstanding the fact that the question had already been settled by Russian Marxists at a conference held in June, 1901, in a resolution to the effect that the terrorist method of struggle was politically inexpedient and inopportune and was to be used only in exceptional circumstances.—p. 69.

144. In a letter dated November, 1897, later published in pamphlet form under the title of *Contemporary Tasks and the Tactics of the Russian Social-Democrats,* Geneva, 1898, Paul Axelrod outlined two possible lines of development of Russian Social-Democracy, *viz.:* (1) the labour movement will resort exclusively to the industrial struggle against the employers, will not play an independent revolutionary rôle and in the struggle for political liberty will follow the lead of the bourgeois intellectuals; or (2) the working class will be organised into a Social-Democratic Party and will independently conduct the struggle for political liberty.

Axelrod warned the Social-Democrats against becoming entirely absorbed in industrial strikes (the first line of development) which must lead to the belittling of the rôle of the proletariat as the principal revolutionary force in the struggle against absolutism.—p. 70.

145.—Lassalle's letter to Marx dated from Düsseldorf, June 24, 1852, is included in *Briefe von Ferdinand Lassalle an Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels 1849–1862*, published by Franz Mehring, Stuttgart, 1902.—p. 71.

146. This refers to an article by Martov in *Iskra*, No. 15, dated December 6, 1901, entitled "The Anniversary of Kazan Square, St. Petersburg," in commemoration of the political demonstration that took place in St. Petersburg on December 6, 1876, in front of the Kazan Cathedral. The article described the subsequent history of the revolutionary movement and dwelt at length on the demonstration that took place in the same Square on March 4, 1901.—p. 72.

147. The Memorandum of the Minister of Finance approved on December 29, 1901, and published in the *Official Gazette* on January 1, 1902, and reproduced in other newspapers. The newspaper from which Lenin quoted is not known.—p. 76.

148. This refers to correspondence from Siberia published in *Iskra*, No. 2, February, 1901, under the heading, "On the Great Siberian Railroad." The author of this communication was probably G. Krzhizhanovsky, a highly skilled engineer who now occupies a prominent place on the Supreme Economic Council of the U.S.S.R.—p. 77.

149. The passages are quoted from an article entitled "Who is Responsible for Mr. Stakhovich," signed by A. P. G. and published in *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, December 18, 1901.—p. 82.

150. Published by the Ural Social-Democratic group (issue No. 1, 1899). —p. 84.

151. Published illegally in Vilna and in St. Petersburg. As far as is known, two pamphlets were issued in the series in 1900: No. 1, *A Statement by the Editors of the Workers' Library*, written by M. Broydo, and No. 2, *The Transvaal and China—Two Speeches by Keir Hardie and Wilhelm Liebknecht*. In a comment on the Library, *Iskra*, No. 2, February, 1901, expressed sympathy with the policy adopted by it to go beyond the narrow economic programme of action for the working class and to call for a struggle against the autocracy and the bourgeoisie for political liberty. *Iskra*, however, expressed disagreement with the opinion expressed in the first pamphlet that "*for the time being* the Russian bourgeoisie has nothing more to wish for" and that "the bourgeoisie has been granted some, if meagre, political liberty." From internal evidence we may assume that this comment was written by Lenin.—p. 84.

152. This is quoted from an article by L. Nadezhdin, published in *Kanun Revolutsii* (*The Eve of the Revolution*)—a review issued by the Svoboda (Freedom) Revolutionist-Socialist group and edited by the same Nadezhdin. The article in question was published in No. 1 of this review, dated 1901. This article contains a general criticism of *Iskra* and in particular of Lenin's articles "Where to Begin" and "The Lessons of the Crisis." The remark quoted

by Lenin was called forth by Lenin's encouragement of the Zemstvo employés to protest against their grievances and to stand up for their rights.—p. 84.

153. Lenin refers to the following passage in the *Communist Manifesto.* The organised proletariat "compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. . . . Collisions between the classes of the old society further, in many ways, the course of the development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself in constant hattle: At first with the aristocracy; later on with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all times with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these countries it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for its help, and thus drag it into the political arena. The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education; in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie." (Moore's translation, Ch. I.)—p. 85.

154. Lenin refers to the words of Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto:* "In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against existing social and political order of things." (Moore's translation, Ch. IV.)—p. 85.

155. This refers to the famous Dreyfus case in France in 1894 in which Captain Dreyfus, a Jewish officer in the French army, was falsely accused of high treason on the evidence of documents placed by the monarchists and clericals in the General Staff of the French army, which documents were afterwards proved to have been forgeries. The court of the first instance found Dreyfus guilty and sentenced him to imprisonment on Devil's Island, the French penal colony. In 1897 an agitation was commenced for a new trial and the Socialists and all the progressive elements in France rallied on the side of Dreyfus. The case was retried in 1899, and the trial assumed the character of a political struggle between the Republicans and the Monarchists and so strong was public pressure that Dreyfus was set free. The result was greeted as a victory for Republicanism.—p. 85.

156. The pamphlet *What Is To Be Done?* may he regarded as one of the most important documents of the Bolshevik movement of that period, for it exercised enormous influence upon the subsequent development of revolutionary Social-Democracy in Russia. The idea of writing this pamphlet occurred to Lenin in 1901 and his article, "Where to Begin," published in *Iskra,* No. 4 (see p. 109, Book I of this volume), was practically a synopsis of this pamphlet which Lenin informed his readers was being prepared for the press. Pressure of other work, however, prevented Lenin from going on with the writing of it until the end of that year.—p. 89.

157. Two separate tendencies in the German labour movement in the period between 1863 and 1875, one led by Ferdinand Lassalle and the other by August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht. The latter took their stand on the Social-Democratic platform adopted at the congress in Eisenach from which it took its name. In 1863 Lassalle started a movement for the formation of an independent working class political party and in the same year he formed the General German Labour League, the programme of which was to fight in

a legal manner for universal suffrage and for state subsidised co-operative workshops. The Lassalleans published a magazine called *The Social-Democrat* to which at first Marx, Engels and Liebknecht contributed articles. After the death of Lassalle in 1864, the party was led by Schweitzer who supported the Bismarckian policy of uniting Germany by subjecting her to the rule of the Prussian junkers and the Hohenzollern dynasty. This caused Marx and Engels to break their connection with the paper.

Dissatisfied with the policy conducted by the Lassalleans, a group of workers led by Bebel and Liebknecht left the party in 1866 and formed the Saxon Party which for a time was affiliated to the bourgeois German People's Party. In 1869, however, the Saxon group broke away from that organisation and, after an abortive attempt to unite with the Lassalleans, decided at a congress that was convened in Eisenach, to form the Social-Democratic Party. Between the two parties a fierce controversy raged over the question of parliamentary tactics. The Lassalleans were in favour of "practical politics" while the Social-Democrats stood for utilising parliament as a platform from which to expose the ruling class and to propagate the party's aims. Both sections were united at last at the Gotha Congress in 1875.—p. 94.

158. Two separate tendencies in the French Socialist movement. At a labour congress, convened in Marseilles in 1879 under the auspices of the Marxists, or "collectivists" as they called themselves, a resolution was adopted to form a Socialist party. The programme of that party, which was adopted in 1880, was drafted witb the collaboration of Marx and Engels. In 1882 tbe party split into two factions. One was the Guesdist faction led by Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue who advocated an independent revolutionary proletarian policy aiming at the capture of political power by the proletariat, *i. e.*, the dictatorship of the proletariat; they rejected the policy of co-operation with the bourgeoisie and advocated the establishment of centralised control within the party. The other section was the Possibilist section, led by Brousse and Malon. The term Possibilist means, in fact, opportunist and was used in contrast to the term "impossibilist," which was applied to the revolutionary policy of the Guesdists. The Possibilists represented a moderate reformist wing wbich strove to combine Marxism with Proudhonism and to obscure the Communistic aims of the proletariat. They attached the greatest importance to obtaining practical reforms by electing representatives to municipal bodies and to parliament. The form of party organisation they advocated was a federation of autonomous local organisations. Besides these two groups there was also a syndicalist group led by Allemand which broke away from the Possibilists, but was hostile to the Guesdists. They concentrated their activities upon agitation for the general strike. There was also the Blanquist group led by Edouard Vaillant who inclined towards Marxism and also the Federation of Independents led by Jean Jaurès, who advocated co-operation with the bourgeoisie. In view of the political crisis caused by the Dreyfus case (see Note 155) measures were taken to unite all the Socialist groups. Tbe entry of the Socialist Millerand into the bourgeois cabinet roused a fresh conflict around the question of independent revolutionary class struggle or "ministerialism." The former was advocated by Guesde and the latter by Jaurès. Failing to reach agreement the Guesdists formed an independent party called the Socialist Party of France while the reformist groups combined to form the French Socialist Party. Subsequently, a United Socialist Party of France was formed. On the outbreak of the imperialist war in 1914 Jules Guesde supported the French government in the war and took a seat in the cabinet.—p. 94.

159. The Fabian Society, an organisation consisting mainly of English intellectuals, established in 1884 by T. Davidson, Bernard Shaw and Sidney and Beatrice Webb chiefly to counteract the propaganda of revolutionary Marxian Socialism which had then been started by the Social-Democratic Federation formed by H. M. Hyndman, John Burns, Tom Mann, Harry Champion and Jack Williams. The Fabian Society took its name from the Roman general Fabius Cunctator (–203 B.C.) who in his campaigns was guided by the motto "Advance slowly." He defeated Hannibal by avoiding direct engagements and using dilatory tactics. The Fabian Society pursues the aim of securing gradual reforms. Its ultimate goal is a bureaucratic form of state Socialism. The Society is affiliated to the Labour Party.—p. 94.

160. In an article in *Iskra*, No. 2, February, 1901, entitled "On the Threshold of the Twentieth Century," Plekhanov referred to the nineteenth century as the century of the working class movement for emancipation while the twentieth century, he claimed, will witness the achievement of the best and most radical aspirations of the nineteenth century. However, the path would be difficult and the victory not an easy one. Many defeats and disappointments are in store. Many who seem to be bound together by close ties will differ and fall out with each other. Already two separate tendencies are to be observed in the great Socialist movement and perhaps the revolutionary struggles of the twentieth century may witness a breach between the Social-Democratic "Mountain" and the Social-Democratic "Gironde." Plekhanov's forecast was confirmed by events not only in the Russian Social-Democratic movement, but in the international movement as a whole and at the moment of crisis Plekhanov himself, who had foretold the rise of a Social-Democratic "Gironde" that would support the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, was not found in the camp of the "Mountain."—p. 98.

161. *Bez Zaglaviya* (*Without a Title*)—the title adopted by a magazine published in 1906 by the semi-Cadet Group led by E. Kuskova, S. Prokopovich and V. Bogucharsky. Cadet was the contracted title of the bourgeois liberal party, the full name of which was Constitutional Democratic Party.—p. 98.

162. This refers to a report on the German Social-Democratic Congress in the *Vorwärts*, June 6, 1877.—p. 99.

163. This was the appellation originated in Germany (*Katheder Sozialisten*) and given to the school of University Professors of bourgeois political economy which opposed both the Manchester school and its advocacy of non-interference of the state in economic life, and the Marxian school which advocated the class struggle and the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system. The Socialists of the Chair advocated the idea of the state,—which is presumed to be a non-class State,—exercising greater influence upon the production and distribution of national wealth with due consideration for the "just" demands of the workingclass and with a view to restricting the excessive claims of the propertied classes in order to soften class antagonisms. Prominent among the German Professorial Socialists were Schmoller, Brentano, Schoeffle, Herkner, Schultz-Gavernitz and Wagner.—p. 99.

164. Lenin here refers to B. Krichevsky's article "Times of Alarm in France," in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, Nos. 2-3, August, 1889. In this article Krichevsky describes the factional strife in the Socialist movement in France and supports

Millerand's entry into the bourgeois cabinet. One of the members of this cabinet was General Galliffet, the executioner of the Paris Commune, which made Millerand's entry into that cabinet all the more reprehensible. Krichevsky described General Galliffet as an enemy of the clericals and as one who displayed unquestioned obedience to the laws of the Republic. In defence of Millerand's entry into such a government he argued that in view of the danger confronting the Republic it was necessary to think of the present and future and not of the past and that Millerand would be able to see to it that Galliffet remained a loyal instrument of the Republic and only as an instrument!—p. 100.

165. The Hanover Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party was held on October 9-15, 1899. The principal question on the agenda was: "The attack on the fundamental views and tactics of the party." This question arose out of the appearance in the party of a faction led by Edward Bernstein which criticised the fundamental ideas of Marxism and demanded a revision of the policy and tactics of Social-Democracy and the transformation of the party into a democratic reformist party. The party congress voted against these proposals.—p. 100.

166. The Lübeck Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party was held on September 22-28, 1899. As at the Hanover Congress, the principal question was the fight against Revisionism. By the time the Congress was held, a Right Wing had become definitely crystallised in the German Social-Democratic Party, with its own programme of action and a monthly magazine—the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*. A number of party locals condemned Bernstein's views, but the central organ of the party *Vorwärts* adopted an attitude of friendly neutrality. At the congress, Bernstein demanded "freedom of criticism" and was supported by Heine and David. Bebel and Kautsky, the leaders of the party, adopted a "centrist position." They criticised Bernsteinism, but they also opposed the Left Wing, led by Parvus. The Congress rejected the resolution moved by Heine in favour of freedom of criticism and finally adopted a resolution censuring Bernstein for criticising the party at non-party meetings, but left the question of the existence of the Right Wing of the party an open one.—p. 100.

167. The Stuttgart Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party was held on October 3-8, 1898. The central question discussed was that of Bernstein's Revisionism. One section of the congress led by Bebel and Kautsky was in favour of combating Bernsteinism by argument and by exposing its errors. The minority led by Parvus and Rosa Luxemburg demanded that strong measures be taken against Bernstein.—p. 100.

168. Lenin here refers to an article published in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, Nos. 4 and 5, for November and December, 1899, but the article referred to was dated October 22, 1899.—p. 100.

169. In an article entitled "What Has Happened?" in *Zarya*, No. 1, April, 1901, dealing with the crisis in Russian public thought, Starover, literally "Old Believer," the pseudonym adopted by A. N. Potresov, put the question: Why is it that on our soil the scepticism of the notorious "reformer," of Marxism (*i. e.*, Bernstein) has been so successful and yet at the same time there are so many masked and so few avowed adherents of this theory in Russia, as if Bernsteinism were a secret disease which cannot be referred to openly?—p. 101.

170. *The Writer Who Got a Swelled Head,* the title of one of Maxim Gorky's early stories.—p. 103.

171. Compiled by a group of St. Petersburg Marxists in 1895. After leaving the press, the book was seized by the censor and destroyed. A score or so of copies were saved from the censor's clutches, however, and these were afterwards distributed among Social-Democrats. The publication of this volume was an important literary event in the history of Russian public thought. —p. 103.

172. Russian translations of the following books by Bernstein were published in 1901: 1. *Historical Materialism.* 2. *Social Problems.* 3. *Problems of Socialism and the Tasks of Social-Democracy.* The censor allowed these books to be circulated freely.—p. 104.

173. Zubatov's recommendation to the workers to read the works of Bernstein was reported in *Iskra,* which received the communication from an unknown Moscow comrade who signed himself "Ex-Economist."—p. 104.

174. A magazine devoted to history, pricipally to the history of the Narodnik movement and to earlier public movements in Russia (The Decembrists, etc.) —p. 105.

175. "The Profession of Faith," was written by the Kiev Committee probably in 1899.—p. 105.

176. The Programme of *Rabocheye Dyelo,* the organ of the League of Russian Social-Democrats, was published in No. 1 of that paper, April, 1899, in the form of an editorial statement printed on a separate sheet.—p. 108.

177. The announcement of the resumption of publication activities of the Emancipation of Labour group was written by P. B. Axelrod at the very end of 1899 and issued as a separate publication dated 1900. By an agreement arrived at with the League of Russian Social-Democrats at the end of 1898 the Emancipation of Labour group was to have undertaken the publication of a series of pamphlets on the programme outlined in the "announcement." The rupture that took place between the Emancipation of Labour group and the League in April, 1900, prevented this plan from being carried out.—p. 108.

178. At the time these lines were written two numbers of *Zarya* had been published: No. 1, April, 1901, and a double number, 2 and 3, in December, 1901.—p. 109.

179. This passage is quoted from Marx's remarks on the programme of the German party (*A Criticism of the Gotha Programme*) or to be more exact from Marx's letter to Bracke of May 5, 1875, written in connection with this criticism. —p. 109.

180. In a pamphlet entitled *Contemporary Tasks and Tactics of the Russian Social-Democrats,* 1898, P. Axelrod wrote that if Social-Democracy concentrated its attention exclusively upon the purely economic struggle, the more revolutionary elements of the proletariat, unable to find an outlet for their

political aspirations, would adopt terroristic tactics as happened in the seventies, or some other form of bourgeois democratic revolutionary activity.—p. 110.

181. The pamphlet was written in Vilna in 1894 by A. Kramer, in which he described the experience of the Bund in the work of agitation among the Jewish workers. This pamphlet exercised considerable influence upon the Russian Social-Democrats of that time, for it called upon them to abandon their restricted circle propaganda and to adopt mass agitation among the workers on the basis of their minor economic needs. The pamphlet, however, suffered from the defect that it overemphasised the importance of the economic struggle.—p. 115.

182. A monthly historical magazine published between 1870 and 1917. —p. 116.

183. Of the articles enumerated by Lenin intended for *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 1, only one article has been traced, namely, "What Are Our Cabinet Ministers Thinking About?"—p. 116.

184. Lenin here refers to himself who, with Vaneyev, Martov, Krzhizhanovsky and others, belonged to the St. Petersburg League of Struggle.—p. 116.

185. A newspaper published by the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class. Only two numbers were published: No. 1 dated January, 1897, was issued at the beginning of February in 300 or 400 mimeographed copies. No. 2 was made up in March and sent abroad and there printed with slight alterations in September, 1897. Both numbers were made up entirely by B. Goryev (Goldman).—p. 116.

186. Published by the League of Russian Social-Democrats in the period of 1896-1899. The first eight numbers were edited by the Emancipation of Labour group—G. Plekhanov, P. Axelrod, V. Zasulich. The last number, Nos. 9-10, followed an Economist line and was edited by a temporary editorial board.—p. 118.

187. The "private meeting" to which Lenin refers, and at which the differences between the "old" and "young" members of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle were revealed, took place in the period between February 26 and 29, 1897. The "several comrades of A. A. Vaneyev" referred to were Lenin, Martov, Krzhizhanovsky and several other members of the League who had just been released from prison for three days prior to their deportation to Siberia, and who took advantage of their temporary liberty to meet the "young" members of the League.—p. 118.

188. The leading article in *Rabochaya Mysl*, October, 1887, was reprinted in *Listok Rabotnika*, November, 1898.—p. 119.

189. This refers to the praise expressed by V. Ivanshin, later one of the editors of *Rabocheye Dyelo* for the three numbers of *Rabochaya Mysl* issued. Ivanshin, however, expressed special praise for the very passages which Lenin particularly condemned in *What Is To Be Done?* The publication of V. Ivanshin's remarks convinced the Emancipation of Labour group that they were right in refusing to edit the publications of the League of Russian Social-Democrats.—p. 119.

190. The pseudonym of V. P. Vorontsov, a very prominent Narodnik of the eighties, who championed the more obsolete of the Narodnik views and who in the nineties became still more reactionary and opposed mass political struggle. Lenin applies here the term "the V.V.s of Russian Social-Democracy" to the adherents of *Rabochaya Mysl* as the opportunist Right Wing of Social-Democracy who pushed the working class political struggle into the background, advocated primitive and restricted methods of fighting for a restricted goal, and, therefore, played a reactionary rôle in the labour movement.—p. 120.

191. The Congress of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, which took place at Brünn in 1899, passed a resolution in favour of revising the old Hainfeld Programme of 1888 in accordance with the changed condition of the struggle of the Austrian working class. A special commission consisting of Victor Adler, Daszynski, Ellenbogen and others, was appointed to draw up a new programme. The programme as drafted by this commission modified the fighting spirit of the old programme and on being published in August, 1901, was severely criticised as being a concession to Bernsteinism. One of the critics of the new programme was Karl Kautsky, who in an article in the *Neue Zeit* declared that the old Hainfeld Programme more correctly expressed the Social-Democratic conception of the historical processes and of the tasks of the working class. Adler disagreed with this criticism and the new programme was adopted at the Vienna Congress of the Austrian Party in November, 1901, after some slight amendments introduced by the Programme Committee, of which Kautsky was a member, had been adopted. The passage quoted by Lenin is taken from Kautsky's article in the *Neue Zeit* referred to above.—p. 122.

192. Lenin refers here to a book by S. N. Prokopovich, *The Labour Movement in the West*, which was thoroughly impregnated with the spirit of reformism and liberalism.—p. 124.

193. Lenin refers here to an article by P. Struve entitled "Die Marxsche Theorie der sozialen Entwicklung" ("The Marxian Theory of Social Development"), published in *Brauns Archiv*, Vol. XIV, Nos. 5 and 6, and his review of Bernstein's *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie* (English translation, *Evolutionary Socialism*), and also Karl Kautsky's *Bernstein und das sozialdemokratische Programm* (*Bernstein and the Social Democratic Programme*). Struve criticised the general theory of Marxism and particularly its philosophical premises. He tried to show that social antagonisms were diminishing. He denied the inevitability of the social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Struve's revisionist views were criticised by Plekhanov in his *Criticism of Our Critics*, a series of articles published in *Zarya*, Nos. 1, 2-3 and 4.—p. 124.

194. In the period between 1860 and 1870 the German Progressive (Liberal) Party, in order to bring the working class under its influence, adopted the idea of establishing trade unions. The leaders of this bourgeois-liberal trade union movement were Schultze, Max Hirsch and Dunker. The trade unions they formed were based on the principle of harmony between capital and labour and the avoidance of strikes. Membership in these unions was open not only to workers but also to capitalists. Every member on joining had to sign a declaration to the effect that he was in no way connected with Social-

Democracy. Although the efforts of Hirsch and Dunker met with a certain amount of success, the organisations they formed were insignificant compared with the Social-Democratic trade unions. In 1897 the Hirsch-Dunker unions had a membership of 75,000 while the membership of the Social-Democratic unions was 419,000.—p. 124.

195. A Socialist-Revolutionist review, published in London in 1899 and edited by E. A. Serebryakov. Among the regular contributors were the Socialists-Revolutionists, E. E. Lazarev, N. Chaikovsky, B. Olenin (Chernov) and the Anarchist, V. Cherkezov.—p. 126.

196. When Lenin's pamphlet was published with Axelrod's preface, the adherents of *Rabocheye Dyelo* published in their paper (No. 1, April, 1899) an unsigned review of it, in which they endeavoured to camouflage their real opinions, and, contrary to the truth, declared that "we do not know to which 'young' comrades Axelrod refers"; that "the younger Russian Social-Democrats who have grown up and are operating in the field of the modern mass movement already apply the author's point of view," and that "the main ideas outlined in the pamphlet wholly coincide with the editorial programme of *Rabocheye Dyelo*."—p. 127.

197. It is difficult to say definitely what fact in the history of the St. Petersburg Social-Democratic organisation it was that Lenin regarded as marking the dividing line between the "old" and "new" tendencies in the St. Petersburg League of the Struggle. In all probability it was the merging of the *Rabochaya Mysl* with the St. Petersburg League. Up to the middle of 1898 *Rabochaya Mysl* was published as the organ of an independent literary group. In the autumn of the same year negotiations were commenced with the League which resulted in the amalgamation of the two organisations in December and marked the decided turn of the St. Petersburg League towards Economism.—p. 127.

198. It is not known to what works of L. Woltmann Lenin here refers. At the time *What Is To Be Done?* was being written, two books by Woltmann had been translated into Russian: *Darwinism and Socialism*, 1900, and *Historical Materialism*, 1901.—p. 129.

199. N. Beltov was the pseudonym of G. Plekhanov under which he published his book *The Development of the Monistic Conception of History*, 1894. —p. 132.

200. Literally, Narcissus Pug Nose. The humorous pseudonym adopted by Martov, by which he signed his "Hymn of the Modern Russian Socialist," published in *Zarya*, No. 1. In this "Hymn" written in verse form, Martov ridicules the Economists and their "sober" programme. Some of the verses of this hymn ended with the refrain: "Slowly pacing, in hesitating zig-zags, slowly advance working people," etc.—p. 133.

201. This passage is quoted from B. Krichevsky's "The Economic and Political Struggle in the Russian Labour Movement," in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 7, August, 1900.—p. 141.

202. This refers to the introduction to the Resolution adopted by the fourth congress of the Jewish Bund, in April, 1901.—p. 141.

203. Lenin refers to Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *The History of Trade Unionism.*—p. 142.

204. This was an article signed B-v in *Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 6, April, 1900, written by Boris Savinkov, who at that time belonged to the Social-Democratic movement and was a member of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle. Later he joined the Socialists-Revolutionists and became a terrorist.—p. 154.

205. The organ of a small group of revolutionary Socialists formed in May, 1901, and led by L. Nadezhdin (E. Zelensky). This group, while agreeing with the Social-Democrats on the importance of the working class in the struggle for political liberty and the overthrow of the autocracy, at the same time advocated "excitative" terror for the purpose of accelerating the proletarian revolutionary movement.—p. 154.

206. The letter of the weaver describing his own and his comrade's impressions on having the contents of *Iskra*, No. 4, particularly Lenin's article, "Where to begin," read to them is a characteristic expression of the mood of the more progressive workers at that time who were no longer satisfied with the ideas advocated by *Rabochaya Mysl.* "We no longer require benefit clubs," wrote this worker, "or circles, or even books; you just teach us how to fight, how to go into battle."—p. 167.

207. This is a passage from an article by P. Axelrod, written in November, 1897, for the *Rabochaya Gazeta*, No. 2, but not published in that paper. In December of that year, however, it was published together with another article in his pamphlet *Contemporary Tasks and Tactics of the Russian Social-Democrats*, Geneva, 1898.—p. 169.

208. An article written by P. Struve, in *Iskra*, No. 2, February, 1901, and continued in No. 4, May, 1901. No other articles by Struve were published in *Iskra.*—p. 169.

209. The second part of Struve's article referred to in the note above dealt with the secret memorandum drawn up in 1899 by the Minister of Finance, Witte, against the proposals of the Minister of the Interior, Goryemykin, to establish Zemstvos or rural district councils in Western Russia.—p. 171.

210. This refers to the article in *Iskra*, No. 8, September 10, 1901, on the secret conference of Zemstvoists that was held in June, 1901. In this article reference is made to the fact that these Zemstvoists found it necessary to discuss not local Zemstvo questions but national political questions and the author called upon the Zemstvoists to put up strenuous and organised resistance to the government's attempt to crush all local government institutions.—p. 171.

211. Reference is made here to an article by Vera Zasulich, in *Iskra*, No. 3, April, 1901, on "Contemporary Affairs," which dealt with the unrest among the students and the student demonstrations in February and March of that year.—p. 171.

212. A moderate Liberal newspaper, published in 1899-1902 under the editorship of G. P. Sazonov. It was suppressed in 1902 for publishing an article by Amphiteatrov, under the English pseudonym Old Gentleman, in

which the Romanov dynasty was ridiculed. The article was entitled "Messrs Obmanovs" (Betrayers) with the evident play on the name Romanov.—p. 171.

213. A phrase that occurred in a speech delivered by Nicholas II, to a delegation of Zemstvoists in 1895. A. Potresov criticised *Rossiya* for fostering "senseless dreams" among the people, about the readiness of the government to grant reforms without a fight.—p. 171.

214. This refers to an article in *Iskra,* No. 7, August, 1901, entitled "The Incident in the Yekaterinoslav Zemstvo."—p. 171.

215. This refers to an article entitled "Viatka Blacklegs," in *Iskra,* No. 9, October, 1901, criticising the failure of the statisticians employed by the Viatka Zemstvo, to join in sympathy with the Yekaterinoslav statisticians, who had declared a boycott against Rodzianko, the chairman of the Yekaterinoslav Zemstvo.—p. 171.

216. This was a small group of intellectuals and workers organised in the spring of 1899 but which was suppressed by the gendarmes six weeks after its formation. Its programme was practically the only thing it published. In this programme it declared that in despotic Russia the tsarist government is identical with the government of capitalists and that the fight against the capitalists would at the same time be a political struggle.—p. 180.

217. Apparently this refers to A. Martynov, now a Communist.—p. 187.

218. This refers to the St. Petersburg League for the Emancipation of the Working Class, of which Lenin was a member.—p. 200.

219. A Narodnik or Populist organisation formed in St. Petersburg in 1876. Among the founders of this organisation were Mark and Olga Natanson, A. Mikhailov, G. Plekhanov and Zundulevich. Later Sofia Perovskaya joined it. Conducted as a secret organisation, it carried on its work among the students, the workers and peasants, and took part in organising the strike movement in 1878-1879. In December, 1876, it organised a demonstration on the Kazan Square in St. Petersburg, which was forcibly broken up by police and soldiers. The organisation, however, carried on its activities mainly among the peasantry, with the aim of bringing about a peasant uprising. Their view was that peasant Russia could immediately adopt Socialism in view of the widespread existence of the *mir*, or peasant commune, in the Russian rural districts. As a means to their end the Narodniks resorted to terroristic acts. A declaration made at the conference of the organisation held in June, 1879, that terror was one of the principal methods of fighting against the tsarist despotism, led to a split and a new party was formed called the Chorny Peredel (literally, Black Re-distribution), meaning thereby a re-distribution of the land by the masses of the people. This new group insisted upon the necessity of achieving the revolution by means of the mass action of the workers and peasants. Among the members of this group were Plekhanov, Leo Deutsch, Vera Zasulich and Paul Axelrod. The organisation existed only for a few months but it served as a step by which a section of the Narodniks—Plekhanov, Axelrod and Zasulich, passed to Marxism and Social-Democracy. The main group of Zemlya i Volya continued to exist under the name of Narodnaya Volya (The Will of the People). See note 32.—p. 207.

220. This is a passage from a review by V. Zasulich in *Zarya*, Nos. 2-3 of two publications by the Svoboda group: (1) *The Regeneration of Revolutionism in Russia* and (2) the journal *Svoboda*.—p. 210.

221. The journal *Nakanunye* supported the League of Russian Social-Democrats which had turned towards Economism in the fight between it and the Emancipation of Labour group led by Plekhanov. E. Lazarev, the editor of *Nakanunye* describes Plekhanov's slashing criticism of the "young members" in his *Vademecum* as the "excommunication of the most sincere, most active and conscientious comrades from the Social-Democratic church."—p. 212.

222. The book referred to is Kautsky's *Der Parlamentarismus, die Volksgesetzgebung und die Sozialdemokratie*, Stuttgart, Dietz, 1893 (*Parliamentarism, Democratic Legislation and Social-Democracy*).—p. 214.

223. This was the report submitted to the International Socialist Congress held in Paris in 1900 by the League of Russian Social-Democrats and *Rabocheye Dyelo*.—p. 216.

224. Lenin refers here to an article by an ultra-moderate economist signed R. M. published in *Rabochaya Mysl*, special supplement, September, 1899, in which the words mentioned occur.—p. 220.

225. The *Rabochaya Mysl* group, in addition to sixteen numbers of its paper of the same name, published a number of pamphlets describing conditions in particular factories.—p. 223.

226. Lenin apparently refers to I. V. Babushkin, a mechanic and prominent member of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle.—p. 223.

227. At the first congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Party in 1898 a resolution was passed on the Jewish Bund to the effect that the Bund was affiliated to the party as an autonomous organisation having independence only on questions specially affecting the Jewish proletariat. At its fourth congress in April, 1901, the Bund passed a resolution in favour of the federal system of organisation and against the organisational principles adopted at the first party congress. This action was strongly criticised by *Iskra* as a symptom of nationalism and separatism and its legality challenged. To this criticism the Bund replied in a letter to *Iskra*, No. 8, September 10, in which it declared that it was responsible only to the Central Committee of the party, or to the party congress and not to any single body affiliated to the party, let alone to a group the only evidence of whose association with the party was the imprint on the literature it publishes. The last part of this sentence hinted that *Iskra* was a mere "pretender" as party organ, and to this Lenin refers.—p. 228.

228. For considerations of secrecy Lenin put in this footnote in order to prevent "outsiders" from following the sequcnce of events inside the party. As a matter of fact, the events occurred in the order of sequence as related in the text.—p. 228.

229. This refers to the negotiations between the League of Struggle and Lenin concerning the writing of these pamphlets. The two pamphlets mentioned were written by Lenin in the latter half of 1897.—p. 228.

230. The member of the *Iskra* group referred to is L. Martov, author of the pamphlet, *The Cause of Labour in Russia.*—p. 228.

231. This refers to negotiations between the Central Committee of the Bund and Lenin concerning the resumption of publication of the *Rabochaya Gazeta.*—p. 229.

232. This refers to I. Kh. Lalayants, a member of the Kharkov Committee, who in the spring of 1900 visited Lenin in Moscow.—p. 230.

233. Apparently the reference to No. 12 was a slip of the pen or a printer's error, for actually the last number published at the time Lenin wrote this was No. 10, and the next one should have been No. 11. Nos. 11-12 were published as a double number.—p. 234.

234. This letter was apparently sent to *Iskra*, but not published.—p. 237.

235. This is a passage from an article by D. I. Pisarev entitled "Errors of Immature Thoughts" written in 1864.—p. 241.

236. Lenin paraphrases the following passage in Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire:* "Hegel says somewhere that, upon the stage of universal history all great events and personalities reappear in one fashion or another. He forgot to add that, on the first occasion, they appear as a tragedy; on the second, as a farce." (*The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, 1926, p. 23.)—p. 242.

237. This refers to the student demonstrations supported by the workers that took place in November and December, 1901, in numerous towns of Russia. These are referred to in the article in this volume entitled "The Demonstrations Have Commenced" (see p. 72 of this book).—p. 244.

238. The names of the members of this group are not known.—p. 251.

239. *Zarya*, No. 1, April, 1901, published an article by N. Ryazanov, entitled "Remarks on the Programme of *Rabocheye Dyelo*" and *Iskra*, No. 4, published Lenin's article "Where to Begin."—p. 252.

240. This second group of initiators consisted of D. B. Ryazanov, J. M. Steklov and V. Danyevich, who, after the failure of the Unity Congress established an independent publication group under the name of Borba (Struggle).—p. 242.

241. In an article entitled "The Lübeck Congress of the Social-Democratic Party" published in *Zarya*, Nos. 2-3, December, 1901, signed "Ignotus," L. Martov referred to Krichevsky's tendentious reports to the Berlin *Vorwärts* on the Socialist movement in France which favoured Millerand and the Jauresists and was hostile to the Guesdists. In its issue of January 1, 1902, the *Vorwärts* replied to Martov's article defending Krichevsky. Kautsky intervened in the controversy and in an indirect sort of way defended Martov. Then followed a number of articles and replies by Martov, Krichevsky and the editor of *Vorwärts* and finally, the discussion was wound up by Krichevsky. In its issue, No. 4, of August, 1902, *Zarya* published an article by "Ignotus" entitled "*Vorwärts* and *Zarya*" and another by Parvus entitled "Millerand and *Vor-*

wärts," while *Iskra,* No. 10 of May 10, 1902, summed up the whole discussion. —p. 255.

242. This item should follow much later chronologically but it is given here immediately after *What Is To Be Done?,* in view of its close connection with it.—p. 258.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

A

ADAMOVICH, J.—*See* Vorovsky, V. V.

AKSAKOV, I. S. (1823–1886)—Slavophile publicist. In the fifties and sixties advocated a moderate liberal programme (freedom of the press, abolition of the privileges of the nobility) and denounced administrative abuses; the papers he published in that period were harassed by the censors. Following upon the Polish insurrection he became the advocate of an extreme Nationalist policy in regard to Poland and other non-Russian sections of the Empire, and was in the seventies the most prominent champion of the Slavic mission of tsarist Russia in the Balkans; was deported from Moscow in 1878 for having attacked in a speech Alexander II's "compromising" policy at the Berlin Congress. Essentially a spokesman of the big agrarians at the initial stage of capitalist transformation, A., while sometimes attacking tsarist bureaucracy, always remained a monarchist and an opponent of Western parliamentarianism. —I 126, 141.

ALEXANDER I—Tsar of Russia from 1801 to 1825.—II 61, 63.

ALEXANDER II—Tsar of Russia from 1855 to 1881. After several unsuccessful attempts at assassination, killed with a bomb by members of the Narodnaya Volya, March 1 (14), 1881. See Vera Figner, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, for a detailed account of assassination.—I 137, 139, 148, 154; II 61.

ALEXANDER III—Tsar of Russia from 1881 to 1894.—I 80, 140, 148, 149, 165.

ALEXANDREYEV, P. A. (1849–1891)—Prominent revolutionist of the seventies. Textile worker. Learned reading and writing at the age of sixteen or seventeen, soon joined the Moscow group of Narodnik propagandists (Bardina and others), and became active as Socialist propagandist among workers. In 1877, after two years of confinement in prison, was tried by a special Senate court, together with other members of the group ("Trial of the Fifty"); acting as his own counsel, delivered a famous and widely circulated speech, describing the terrible condition of the workers then prevailing and predicting the inevitable downfall of autocracy. Was sentenced to ten years of forced labour; after the expiration of the term was deported to an obscure hamlet in the Yakutsk region and was killed in 1891 by Yakut robbers.—I 58; II 182.

ALEXEY PETROVICH (1690–1718)—Son of Tsar Peter the Great.—II 51.

AMBROSIUS (A. I. Klucharev, 1821–1901)—Archbishop of Kharkov, writer on church problems; fought relentlessly, through special popular publications, against every manifestation of the movement for freedom.—II 50-51.

ANNENSKY, N. F. (1843–1912)—Publicist of the Narodnik school. Played important part in organisation of Russian statistics; for many years was in charge of the statistical service of the Zemstvos of Kazan and Nizhni-Novgorod

and of the municipality of St. Petersburg. In 1880 he was deported for three years to Tobolsk province for political activities. Contributed regularly to radical publications; in the nineties, one of the editors of the *Russkoye Bogatstvo*, leading Narodnik magazine. In 1903–1905, one of the leaders of the Liberal "Emancipation League." In 1905 attended the congress of the Socialist-Revolutionist Party as representative of the *Russkoye Bogatsvo* group, but did not join the party and founded in 1906, with A. Peshekhonov, V. Myakotin and others, the People's Socialist Party. Later retired from political activity.—II 43.

Arakcheyev, A. A. (1769–1834)—War Minister under Alexander I; ultra-reactionary; exerted enormous influence over domestic and foreign policies of Russia. Founder of military settlements where scores of thousands of peasants were turned into soldiers for life. His name has become a symbol of police despotism and brutal military rule.—I 127.

Arsenyev.—*See* Potresov, A. N.

Auer, Ignatz (1846–1907)—Prominent leader of German Social-Democratic Party; leather worker; repeatedly persecuted by the government. Secretary of the party from 1890; member of Reichstag in 1877–1878, 1880–1887, and from 1890 to his death. Belonged to the Right Wing.—II 206.

Auhagen, O.—German economist, contributor to Thiel's *Landwirtschaftliche Jahrbücher*.—I 238*ff*.

Axelrod, P. B. (1850–1928)—Well-known Russian Menshevik leader. In the seventies a follower of Bakunin, participant in the Narodnik movement. Arrested in a village, where he was engaged in propaganda work; escaped and emigrated abroad, where together with Plekhanov, founded the Emancipation of Labour group in 1883. In 1900, member of the editorial staff of *Iskra*. At the Second Party Congress in 1903, he joined the Mensheviks. Subsequently initiated the idea of a "workers' congress," *i. e.*, of dissolving the Social-Democratic Party into non-partisan labour organisations. One of the leaders of Liquidators. Member of the Zimmerwald Conference, centre group. Active in attempts at organising Two-and-one-half International; conducted an active campaign against Communism. Member of the International Socialist Bureau of the Second International. Died in Berlin in April, 1928.—I 19, 23, 31, 35, 42*ff*, 156; II 127, 146, 156, 169.

B

Bakunin, A. A. (1823–1882)—One of the leaders of the Liberal opposition movement among the nobility of Tver province under Alexander II; in 1862 was arrested and deprived of right to hold public office by appointment or election for having signed, together with his brother, N. A., the opposition address of the Tver nobility.—I 124.

Bakunin, M. A. (1814–1871)—Famous Revolutionist-Anarchist. Left Russia in 1840; in 1848 took active part in the German revolution, was one of the leaders of armed insurrections in Dresden and Prague; was arrested and extradited by Austrian authorities to Russian government; held for years in Peter and Paul and Schluesselburg fortresses; deported to Siberia; escaped abroad and resumed revolutionary activities; in 1863 aided Polish insurgents.

Took part in work of First International; organised within it a secret "Union" of his followers, which gained considerable influence in Latin countries, Bakunin becoming practically the head of the Anarchist movement in Europe. In 1872 was excluded from the International at the demand of Marx, because of his disorganising activities. Bakunin's ideas were of foremost influence upon the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia of the seventies. Russian Social-Democracy began its development by struggling against Bakunin's ideas. —I 124.

Bakunin, N. A. (1818–1901)—Leader of the Liberal opposition movement among the nobility of the Tver province. In 1858 came out for emancipation of the peasants and leaving the land in their hands, with compensation of the owners by the peasants. In 1860 took part in the Assembly of the Nobility which passed a protest resolution against government order prohibiting discussion of peasant emancipation. In 1862 played a leading part in the Assembly of the Nobility which came out for legal equality of all classes and the convocation of a national assembly elected by all classes of the people; was initiator of the address embodying these demands; was tried, confined in the fortress of Peter and Paul, and deprived of the right to hold public office. —I 124.

Ballhorn, J. (1531–1599)—German printer.—II 148.

B. V.—*See* Savinkov, B. V.

Bebel, August (1840–1913)—One of the founders of the German Social-Democratic Party and its leader. Son of a Prussian soldier, and an orphan since the age of twelve, he entered a wood-turning shop at the age of fourteen. As a journeyman, he travelled for two years through Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. Met Wilhelm Liebknecht in 1865, and joined the First International. In the elections of 1867, first held after the introduction of universal suffrage, was elected to the Reichstag. At the Eisenach Congress of 1869 founded, together with Wilhelm Liebknecht, the German Social-Democratic Party. During the Franco-Prussian War refrained, together with Liebknecht, from voting military appropriations, and after the September upheaval in France and the promulgation of a republic, voted against a loan and protested against the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. Consistently fought against every attempt at transforming Social-Democracy into a democratic reformist party (Dühring, Bernstein, Vollmar). Considering himself a disciple of Marx and Engels, he defended both the immediate workers' demands and the general, ultimate aims of the movement. Counteracting Right Wing tendencies in Social-Democracy, Bebel put the formal unity of the party above everything else. Therefore, he was often compelled to compromise with the Right Wingers, drawing a line of demarcation between himself and the Left radical movement growing up under Rosa Luxemburg's leadership in the last years before the war. Leader of the Second International prior to the war.—II 100, 147, 148, 206.

Beltov, N.—*See* Plekhanov, G. V.

Bensing, Franz—German economist, author of a work on the effects of agricultural machinery upon private enterprise and upon national economy. —I 205-207.

BERDYAEV, N. A. (born 1874)—Publicist and philosopher. Originally a Marxist; gradually passing through a stage of Bernsteinian revisionism and attempts to reconcile Marxism with Kantian philosophy, landed into pure mysticism. During 1905 Revolution worked in Cadet party; after defeat of revolution effected complete conciliation with Orthodox Church, and since 1917 Revolution has become an apologist of medieval scholasticism as the only salvation from Communism.—I 157, 201, 225; II 249.

BERNSTEIN, EDUARD (born 1850)—German Social-Democrat. At time of the anti-Socialist laws, editor of the *Sozial-Demokrat,* the party's central organ, issued illegally. In a series of articles published in the *Neue Zeit* in the middle of the nineties, and in his book, *Die Veraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie* (1889; English translation, *Evolutionary Socialism*), endeavoured to effect a revision of the philosophical, economic, and political principles of revolutionary Marxism and to substitute a theory of conciliation of class antagonisms, a denial of Socialist revolution, and a reliance upon gradual permeation of capitalist society by Socialism. Bernstein's views met at once with sharp criticism on the part of Rosa Luxemburg and of Parvus, and later of Plekhanov and Kautsky as well, and gave rise to widespread and acute controversies within international Social-Democracy, with a resulting demarcation of two opposite trends, the Orthodox and the Revisionist. At present Bernstein is one of the leaders of the Second International and Socialist member of Reichstag. His views have completely triumphed in the German Social-Democratic Party and are embodied in its revised programme of 1925.—I 19, 39*ff*, 221, 261; II 99, 100, 104, 106, 131, 214.

BERTHELOT, M. (1827–1907)—Great French chemist; also statesman, senator and minister.—I 222.

BISMARCK (1815–1898)—Chancellor of the German Empire, which he founded as a federation of German states under Prussian hegemony. Established manhood suffrage in Germany. Endeavoured to stem the growth of Socialist influence by enacting the anti-socialist laws in 1878.—I 165.

BLEICHROEDER—Large banking house in Berlin, founded by S. Bleichroeder (died in 1858); played important part in placement of various European government loans, including those of Prussia and Russia.—II 78.

BLEKLOV, S. M. (born in 1860)—Statistician; discharged from Zemstvo service in 1902 for revolutionary activities; member of Socialist-Revolutionist Party; one of the founders of the All-Russian Peasant Union in 1905.—II 44.

BOBO—*See* Struve, P. B.

BOBRIKOV, N. I. (1830–1904)—Governor-General of Finland from 1898; carried out Russification policy; practically abolished constitution of Finland; assassinated June 3, 1904, by Eugene Shaumian, Finnish terrorist.—II 64.

BRAUN, HEINRICH (1854–1926)—Writer on social and political questions; editor and publisher, *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik* (1888–1903); the publication devoted considerable space to the labour movement, labour legislation, and theoretical labour problems, and included among its contributors prominent "critics of Marxism" (Sombart, Bulgakov. Struve. and

others). In 1905–1907 published *Die neue Gesellschaft;* in 1911 founded the *Annalen der Sozialpolitik und Gesetzgebung.*—I 222.

BRENTANO, LUJO (born 1844)—Bourgeois economist; professor of political economy at the University of Munich since 1896; adherent of *Kathedersozialismus,* opponent of Marxian doctrine, advocate of "harmony between classes" and the solution of the social problem through conciliation of the interests of capitalists and workers. Author, *Die Arbeitergilden der Gegenwart,* 1871–1872; *Ueber die Ursachen der heutigen sozialen Not,* 1899, etc.—I 186, 194, 224, 226; II 249.

BULGAKOV, S. N. (born 1871)—Economist and philosopher. Originally one of the "legal Marxists"; later adopted revisionist attitude, especially in his book, *Capitalism and Agriculture;* his subsequent evolution was, through philosophical idealism, to the doctrine of the Orthodox Church. Member of the Second Duma in 1907, joined the Cadet Party. After the 1917 Revolution became a clergyman. Now an émigré.—I 183, 184, 186-195, 197, 199, 201-212, *et passim;* II 107.

BURTSEV, V. L. (born 1862)—Connected with the revolutionary groups of the eighties. While an exile abroad, advocated union of all opposition and revolutionary elements on a liberal platform, but with the use of terrorist tactics. Collected and published documents relating to revolutionary movement in Russia; editor of *Byloye,* historical magazine. Specialised in the revelation of secrets of the Police Department; unmasked the agent-provocateur Azef. Prior to 1905 was close to the Socialist-Revolutionist Party; afterwards supported the Cadet Party. During the World War, a zealous patriot, renounced every opposition to the tsarist régime, returned to Russia. In 1917 frankly supported Kornilov. Since 1917 Revolution, determined enemy of Soviet power, advocate of intervention, supporter of Wrangel and the monarchists.—I 124, 159.

BYELINSKY, V. G. (1811–1848)—Father of Russian publicist school of literary criticism. Connected with same group as Herzen, Ogarev, Bakunin. A conservative Hegelian in his youth, became in the forties the outstanding spokesman of political democracy, social justice, and of materialist philosophy in rudimentary form; strongly influenced by French Socialism of the forties and by Feuerbach's materialism. His revolutionary attitude toward the existing régime found expression in his famous "Letter to Gogol." His collaboration created the prestige of the magazine *Sovremennik,* where his successors were Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky.—II 111.

C

CÆSAR, JULIUS (100-44 B.C.)—Roman general and dictator.—II 14.

CHERNOV, V. M. (born 1876)—Socialist-Revolutionist. Began political career in 1893 as member of the Party of People's Rights. Published in *Russkoye Bogatstvo,* leading Narodnik magazine, a series of articles designed to prove inadequacy of Marxian theory in relation to agriculture (these articles are discussed in Lenin's *The Agrarian Question and the "Critics of Marx"*). Emigrated in 1899 and soon became the leader and spokesman of the Socialist-Revolutionist Party, a member of its Central Committee, and editor of *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya,* its central organ; has since constantly maintained a leading position in the party and exerted a decisive influence upon its policies and

ideology. The characteristics of Chernov are eclectic views, political inconsistency, and the petty-bourgeois nature of his aspirations. During the war he hesitated between defencism and internationalism; after the March Revolution joined the Kerensky government; since the Bolshevik Revolution has been actively fighting the Soviet régime.—I 183, 204, 218-223, 227, 229, 231, 232, 246, 254, 256, 280, 282, 283.

CHERNYSHEVSKY, N. G. (1828–1889)—Described by Marx as "the great Russian scholar and critic, who has masterfully demonstrated the bankruptcy of bourgeois economics." Translated and published J. S. Mill's *Principles of Political Economy* with his own notes inspired by the teachings of Utopian Socialism; author of a number of works, devoted to popularisation of Socialist ideas and to criticism of the agrarian reform of 1861. Author of widely circulated sociological novel, *What Is To Be Done?*, which title may have suggested to Lenin the title of his famous pamphlet included in this volume. Also author of a series of brilliant articles on literary subjects, published in the *Sovremennik*, of which he was one of the editors. Regarded the Russian agricultural commune as a potential embryo of Socialist organisation. Leader of revolutionary movement in the sixties, and one of the moving spirits of the movement in the seventies and eighties. Was arrested in 1862, sentenced to forced labour, and spent the rest of his life mostly in prison and in exile, deprived of direct contact with social and literary activities.—I 124-126, 128, 154; II 111.

CHICHERIN, B. N. (1828–1904)—Professor at Moscow University, jurist and philosopher; moderate Liberal, arch-enemy of Socialism; one of the first critics of Marx in Russian literature.—I 139, 148, 149.

D

DAKHIN, E. S.—One of those prosecuted in connection with the disturbances at the Obukhov plant in May, 1901.—I 305.

DAVID, EDUARD (born 1863)—German Social-Democrat, reformist, author of *Socialism and Agriculture*, defender of petty-bourgeois peasant interests; revisionist. During the imperialist war extreme social-chauvinist. On the eve of the November (1918) Revolution, entered ministry of Prince Maximilian of Baden, which aimed to save the Hohenzollern Empire by concessions. After the 1918 Revolution, Minister without portfolio in Scheidemann's cabinet. In 1918 elected chairman of the National Assembly.—I 207, 208, 221, 222, 231, 232, 280, 282; II 100.

DICKENS, CHARLES (1812–1870)—Famous English writer.—II 28.

DIETZ, H W. (1834–1922)—German Social-Democrat; Reichstag member since 1881; owner of a printing plant in Stuttgart; under name of Dietz Verlag, published Social-Democratic literature and the most important works of Marxist writers. In his youth worked as printer in St. Petersburg, in the plant where Chernyshevsky's *Sovremennik* was printed. Published the *Zarya* magazine, Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* The *Iskra* was secretly printed in Dietz's plant.—I 94; II 89.

DOBROLYUBOV, N. A. (1836–1861)—Critic and publicist, leader of radical thought of the late fifties and early sixties. Continued in the *Sovremennik*

Byelinsky's traditions of literary criticism; under Chernyshevsky's influence adopted materialist views in philosophy and realist attitude in literature. A consistent revolutionist and democrat, Dobrolyubov sharply combated his Liberal contemporaries.—II 73.

DOLGORUKOV, P. V. (1816–1868)—Prince; writer; political exile. Published abroad in 1860 a book *La vérité sur la Russie*, advocating a constitutional form of government for Russia. The book caused a sensation; Dolgorukov was deprived of all civil rights and banished from Russia forever.—I 159.

DRAGOMANOV, M. P. (1841–1895)—Publicist and historian. Taught at the University of Kiev, was discharged in 1875, emigrated and devoted himself to political journalism. A bourgeois Liberal, opposed both to tsarism and to Socialism and the theory of class struggle, he fought alike against the *Narodnaya Volya* and the Social-Democracy and looked for support to the Zemstvo movement; his programme, however, was much broader and more consistent not only than that of the Zemstvo opposition of his days but even than that of the Liberals of the nineties. Dragomanov was also prominent as leader of the moderate wing of the Ukrainian national movement. Published Bakunin's letters and correspondence between Kavelin, Herzen, and Turgenev. —I 123, 124, 134, 135, 141.

DÜHRING, E. K. (1833–1901)—German economist and philosopher, opponent of Marx and of Scientific Socialism; attempted to formulate a "socialist theory" of his own. A demolishing criticism of his views was given by Marx and Engels in their *Herrn Eugen Dühring's Umwälzung der Wissenschaft*, popularly referred to as *Anti-Dühring*.—I 99.

E

ENGELHARDT, A. P.—Governor of Saratov in the 1900's.—II 22, 24.

ENGELS, FRIEDRICH (1820–1895)—Closest friend and inseparable comrade-in-arms of Karl Marx, co-founder of scientific Socialism and dialectical materialism. (*Cf.* a sketch of Engels' life written by V. I. Lenin in 1895—*Collected Works*, Vol. I, and D. Riazanov, *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.*)—I 19, 226, 229, 230; II 95, 99, 108, 111, 115, 129, 160.

F

FIGNER, V. N. (born 1852)—Began her revolutionary career in 1876. Member of Executive Committee of *Narodnaya Volya* until 1883; played an important part, often a leading one, in nearly all plans of that organisation. In 1884 sentenced to death; upon commutation of sentence confined to Schluesselburg fortress; in 1904 deported to Archangelsk. Since 1906 lived abroad. Now living in Soviet Union. An English translation of her book was published in 1927 under the title *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*.—I 150; II 212.

FISCHER, G. (1845–1910)—German publisher in Jena.—I 248.

FOURIER, CHARLES (1772–1837)—Great French Utopian Socialist; gave a pitiless criticism of the capitalist order, with its senseless waste of energies and resources, and drew a picture of future harmonious society constituted by labour communes (phalansteries). In the forties of the last century Fourier's ideas

were introduced to America by Albert Brisbane, who conducted a special column in Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune*. Phalansteries were also established in the United States.—II 111.

FREI—One of Lenin's pseudonyms.—II 59.

FÜHLING (1823–1884)—German writer on agricultural questions; founded (in 1864) the *Landwirtschaftliche Zeitung*.—I 204.

G

GAVRILOV, A. I.—One of those prosecuted in connection with the disturbances at the Obukhov plant in May, 1901.—I 305, 306.

GEORGE—*See* Plekhanov, G. V.

GOLTZ, T. (1839–1905)—Agronomist and economist; professor at the Agricultural Institute in Koenigsberg and in Jena since 1869; later, Director of the Institute. Principal works: *Die ländliche Arbeiterfrage* and *Die Lage der ländlichen Arbeiter im Deutschen Reiche*.—I 211, 212.

GORDEYENKO, E. S. (1812–1897)—Chemist. Active in public affairs; served as President of Kharkov Zemstvo Board and as Mayor of the City of Kharkov. —II 43.

GORKY, MAXIM (pseudonym of A. M. Peshkov; born 1868)—Famous Russian writer, one of the most outstanding figures in modern Russian literature. Actively participated in public life, keeping in touch with the labour movement and the Social-Democratic Party. Being close to Bolsheviks, variously aided the party; kept close relations with V. I. Lenin, who considered Gorky's literary activities of great value for working class. During the war Gorky remained internationalist taking a leading part in the publication of the internationalist magazines, *Sovremennik* and *Lietopis*. In 1917 he participated in the *Novaya Zhizn*, a conciliation paper advocating unity. The November Revolution, however, confused Gorky. Refusing to accept it as a whole, he at the same time was unable to offer active opposition to it and to the proletariat that had accomplished it. Returned to Russia in 1928, closer to the Revolution and the proletarian dictatorship than before.—II 72, 73.

GORYEMYKIN, I. L. (1839–1917)—Typical representative of Russian reactionary bureaucracy; for decades held the highest posts in the tsarist government. Was regarded in government circles as an expert on peasant problems. Minister of the Interior, 1895–1899. In 1906, after Witte's dismissal, was appointed Prime Minister and directed the repression of the revolutionary movement at the time of the first Duma. Again appointed to the same post during the World War; was supported by Rasputin; quit that post on the eve of the March Revolution.—I 122, 145, 146.

GRADOVSKY, A. D. (1841–1889)—Liberal professor of law, publicist. In the early eighties wrote in favour of moderate reforms, while opposing the revolutionary movement; drew for Minister Loris-Melikov a programme of reforms, designed to introduce some elements of constitutional government, without impairing the principle of autocracy.—II 139.

GUESDE, JULES (1845–1922)—Leader and theoretician of French orthodox Marxism. Prior to the war fought against revisionism (Millerand and Jaurès who supported Millerand) and the anarcho-syndicalists. With the declaration of the war shifted to an extremely defencist position, advocating the *union sacré*. Minister without portfolio in the bourgeois "defence of the fatherland" cabinets. One of the most influential leaders of the Second International. —II 66, 94, 148.

H

HASSELMANN, W. (born 1844)—German Social-Democrat. Joined the labour movement under the influence of Lasalle. Editor, with Schweitzer, of *Der Neue Sozialdemokrat;* represented the Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein in the negotiations over fusion with the Social-Democratic Party; later refused offer of joint editorship, with Wilhelm Liebknecht, of the *Vorwärts;* founded his own paper, *Die Rote Fahne*, advocating views approaching anarcho-syndicalism and opposing policies of the party. At the Baden congress of 1880 was expelled from the party for disorganising activities and emigrated to America—II 131, 196.

HECHT, MORITZ—German economist; author of the monograph, *Drei Dörfer der badischen Hard*, 1895.—I 231-237, 253, 274, 280, 282.

HEGEL, G. (1770–1831)—Famous German idealistic philosopher. His dialectic method had an enormous influence on Marx's philosophical conceptions, in which Hegelian dialectics was supplied with a materialistic basis. Hegelian philosophy was very popular at one time and had many adherents in Germany and Russia; interest in it has lately been reawakening.—I 229.

HELLRIEGEL, G.—German agronomist, specialist in agricultural chemistry. —I 222.

HERTZ, FR.—Austrian economist; Social-Democrat; one of the critics of Marx's views on agriculture. In his *Die agrarischen Fragen im Verhältniss zum Sozialismus* (1899), he endeavoured to prove the ability of small land ownership to survive in capitalist surroundings and to resist the competition of large-scale farming. In Russia, Hertz's book was widely used by the Narodniks in their controversies with the Marxists.—I 203-205, 207, 208, 210, 211, 215, 218-222, 224, 225, 231-233, 238, 249-253, 280, 282, 283, 285; II 107.

HERZEN, A. I. (1812–1870)—Famous Russian publicist, father of Russian Narodnik theory and Liberalism. In the forties, he was a Left Wing Hegelian and fought at the head of the Russian "Westerners" (those advocating the acquisition of Western European culture and institutions) against the Slavophiles (those advocating national seclusion and autocracy as a peculiar national characteristic). Having emigrated abroad, published in London and Geneva the magazines, *Polyarnaya Zvezda* [*The Polar Star*] and *Kolokol* [*The Bell*], in which he fought against tsarism and demanded the liberation of the peasants. —I 128, 154; II 111.

HIRSCH, MAX (1832–1905)—German economist and publicist; determined enemy of Social-Democracy. Founder of the "Hirsch-Duncker" labour unions on the model of British trade-unions, resting on the principle of the conciliation of interests of capital and labour. Hirsch's unions were opposed even to

legislative regulation of the relationship between employers and employees. —II, 120, 124.

HÖCHBERG, A. (died 1885)—German Social-Democrat; of bourgeois origin. Published in 1877 the magazine, *Zukunft*, in which the revolutionary tendencies of the Social-Democracy were minimised, and consistent application of the principle of class struggle was opposed. At the time of the anti-Socialist laws, he published the *Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, criticising policies of the party from "Right" standpoint and advocating a policy acceptable to the propertied classes. His views called forth protests on the part of Marx and Engels.—II 131.

HUSCHKE, LEO—German economist. Author, *Landwirtschaftliche Reinertragsberechnungen bei Klein-, Mittel-und Grossbetrieb, dargelegt an typischen Beispielen Mittelthueringens*, 1902.—I 248.

I

IGNATYEV, A. P. (1842–1906)—Minister of the Interior under Alexander III. After the Revolution of 1905, leader of the most reactionary elements of the nobility, bent upon complete annulment of all concessions made by tsarism. Assassinated by Ilyinsky, a Socialist-Revolutionist.—I 140, 141, 158.

ILOVAISKY, D. I. (1832–1920)—Historian and publicist; extreme reactionary and active monarchist; renowned chiefly for his textboooks on history, which were for a long time prescribed for use in secondary schools, to further the spirit of "devotion to the throne" in the young generation, and which became proverbial as models of ignorance and intentional distortion of historical truth.—II 99.

IVANOV—Lieutenant-Colonel; assistant director of the Obukhov plant at the time of the May, 1901, disturbances.—I 119, 120.

IVANOVSKY, N. I. (born 1840)—Professor at Kazan Theological Academy; student of the schism in the Orthodox Church and of the religious sects in Russia.—II 48.

IVANSHIN, V. P. (1869–1904)—Social-Democrat of the Economist faction; one of the editors of *Rabocheye Dyelo;* closely connected with *Rabochaya Mysl.* Emigrated in 1898 and became active in League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, which he represented at the "Unity" congress of October, 1901. In 1902–1903 gradually changed his attitude and finally broke with Economism and joined the *Iskra* group.—II 119, 126, 127, 249.

K

KABLUKOV, N. A. (1849–1919)—Economist and statistician of the Narodnik school; professor at Moscow University; in charge of statistical service of Moscow Zemstvo, conducted a number of model investigations of economic life in Moscow province. In his principal works, *The Problem of Labour in Agriculture* (1884), *Conditions of the Development of Peasant Economy in Russia* (1899), he endeavoured to prove the advantages of small ownership in agriculture. A criticism of his views was given by Lenin in his *Development of Capitalism in Russia* (Vol. III of *Collected Works*).—I 229.

KAREYEV, N. I. (born 1850)—Professor, historian and publicist, belongs to "subjective school of sociology" of Lavrov and Mikhailovsky; contributor to Narodnik and Liberal publications. Author of a number of valuable historical works. His work as a publicist, however, and, in particular, his many articles against historical materialism, are insipid, prolix, and tiresome. During the Revolution of 1905, Kareyev joined the Cadet Party and was a member of its Central Committee; he was also a member of the First Imperial Duma. —II 132.

KATKOV, M. N. (1818–1887)—Publicist. In his youth, close to Byelinsky, Herzen, and Bakunin. From 1851, editor of *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti*, at first a Liberal paper; from the beginning of the sixties, and especially after the Polish insurrection of 1863, he became the spokesman of extreme reaction, zealous advocate of autocracy and of the police régime, opponent of the slightest concessions to liberalism, of the intelligentsia, of the Zemstvos, trial by jury, and all other reforms of the sixties. Katkov and his paper had a tremendous influence among the higher bureaucracy and nobility in the late seventies and the eighties.—I 124, 141, 142, 166; II 166.

KAUTSKY, KARL (born 1854)—Theoretician of German Social-Democracy and of the Second International, economist and historian. In 1880, living in Zurich, contributed to the Socialist press together with Eduard Bernstein, at that time still a Marxist. Having started scientific work under the direct supervision of Engels and having taken over the literary inheritance and the unfinished works of Marx and Engels, Kautsky continued their theoretical work. Editor since 1887 of the theoretical Marxian magazine, *Neue Zeit*. When Bernstein attempted to revise Marx, Kautsky unreservedly criticised his revisionism. With the beginning of the war, Kautsky took a centrist position, making every effort theoretically to combine internationalism with defencism. After the November Revolution he wrote a number of books criticising the Soviet system and defending bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism. After the war, he was very active in attempting to unite the Independent Socialist Party and the Social-Democratic Party. Once the celebrated revolutionary theoretician of international fame, a man considered the greatest Marxian since Marx and Engels, he sank to open counter-revolution following the war.—I 27, 183, 184, 201, 204, 205, 207-213, 215, 219-224, 226-228, 231, 232, 238, 248, 249, 257, 265, 268, 276, 285; II 122, 147, 148, 214, 255.

KAVELIN, K. D. (1818–1885)—Professor of law at St. Petersburg University; publicist, moderate Liberal. In 1861 took part in the preparatory work to peasant emancipation and the establishment of local self-government; advocated communal ownership of land.—I 127, 128, 134.

KENNAN, GEORGE (1845–1924)—American traveller and journalist. In 1870–1871 and in 1885–1886, travelled in Russia and Siberia, studied Russian prisons. Author, *Siberia and the Exile System* (1891), which caused a sensation. Upon arriving again in St. Petersburg in 1901, was immediately deported from Russia.—I 134.

KHALTURIN, S. V. (1856–1882)—Prominent worker revolutionist. One of the main founders of the North-Russian Workers' Union (1878–1879). Member of the Narodnaya Volya; in 1880, by order of the Executive Committee, caused an explosion in the Winter Palace, intended to kill Tsar Alexander II. Was

hanged in 1882 for the assassination of Strelnikov, prosecuting attorney in Odessa.—II 182.

KINKEL, G. (1815–1882)—German poet and historian of art; took part in Baden revolution in 1848; was confined in a fortress, escaped, lived in London, opposed Marx and was criticised by him; later became admirer of Bismarck; from 1866 to 1882, professor in Zurich.—II 71.

KLAWKI, KARL—German economist; author, *Ueber Konkurrenzfähigkeit des landwirtschaftlichen Kleinbetriebes.*—I 239-247, 253, 273.

KLINGENBERG—Governor of Vyatka in 1900.—II 26.

KNIGHT, ROBERT—For over twenty years (since 1875) secretary of the English United Society of Boilermakers; typical representative of conservative trade-unionism.—II 160.

KONDOIDI—Vice-Governor of Samara at the beginning of the twentieth century.—II 39, 40, 41.

KOSHELEV, A. I. (1807–1883)—Slavophile publicist; advocated emancipation of the peasants and leaving the land in their hands, preservation of communal land ownership, the monarchist form of government; opposed western parliamentarism, but favoured a *Zemsky Sobor*, a consultative body to advise the Tsar.—II 127, 128.

KRICHEVSKY, B. N. (died 1919)—One of the first Social-Democrats in Russia; publicist. Emigrated in the early nineties; joined the Emancipation of Labour group, but soon separated and, together with L. Tyshke (Yogikhes), founded a group of his own. Toward the end of the nineties became leader of the Economist opposition to Plekhanov, gained the majority in the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, became editor of *Rabocheye Dyelo*, headed the majority of the Russian delegates to the International Socialist Congress at Paris, in 1900. Also took active part in the Social-Democratic movement in Western Europe, contributed to *Humanité* and *Vorwärts;* inclined toward Bernsteinism and Jaurèsism. The campaign waged against him by *Iskra* and *Zarya* destroyed his influence in the Russian party, and he played no rôle in it since the Second Congress of 1903.—I 65; II 60, 98-100, 128, 129, 132, 145, 160, 181, 188, 208, 220, 225, 234, 240, 249, 253-255, 257.

KRUSE, N. F. (1823–1901)—Liberal writer and public man; was removed in 1867 from the post of President of St. Petersburg Zemstvo Board and deported to Orenburg for opposition to the government.—I 132.

K. T.—Professor; not identified.—II 54.

KUSKOVA, E. D. (born 1869)—Publicist. Originally a Marxist; in the late nineties she belonged to the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad. Became converted to Bersteinian revisionism; author of "Credo." On the eve Revolution of 1905 joined the Liberal "Emancipation League" and supported Struve's publication. Did not, however, join the Cadet Party; founded, together with Prokopovich, Bogucharsky and others, a magazine frankly announced as an organ of "consistent Russian Bernsteinists"; same group pub-

lished a daily paper, *Tovarishch.* After defeat of Revolution of 1905 Kuskova became active in co-operative movement. In 1917 assumed purely Liberal position, pronouncedly anti-Soviet and anti-Bolshevik. Now an émigré and contributor to émigré publications.—II 105.

KUTZLEB—German economist, contributor (in 1895) to Thiel's *Landwirtschaftliche Jahrbücher.*—I 204.

L

LAFARGUE, PAUL (1842–1911)—One of the leaders of French Socialist Party; son-in-law of Marx, under whose supervision he worked for a time; closest associate of Guesde; Marxian economist; took part in First International, Paris Commune, Spanish Socialist movement; author of a number of articles and books, designed to popularise Marxist ideas in various fields of science, and of pamphlets directed against the bourgeois order, *The Right To Be Lazy, Religion of Capitalism,* and others.—II 147.

LAGERMARK—Professor at Kharkov University.—II 74.

LANGSDORFF—Saxon official.—I 249.

LANSKOY, S. S. (1787–1862)—Minister of the Interior under Alexander II, at the time of enactment of emancipation of peasants; resigned in 1861, when reactionary tendencies had prevailed in government spheres.—I 129.

LASSALLE, FERDINAND (1825–1864)—One of the outstanding leaders of German labour movement; prominent orator and publicist. In 1848 took part in revolutionary movement in the Rhineland; contributed to Marx's *Neue Rheinische Zeitung.* His fallacious theory of "iron law of wages" caused Lassalle to neglect the economic struggle and trade organisation of the proletariat and to concentrate chiefly upon the conquest of universal suffrage to enable the workers to exert influence upon the government with a view to securing state credit for producers' associations, through which a gradual transition to Socialism would be effected. With that end in view, Lassalle conducted negotiations with Bismarck which brought forth sharp protests from Marx and Engels. Recent investigations have thrown new light on Lassalle's relations to Bismarck and have substantiated Marx's contentions against Lassalle. Founded in 1863 the *Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein,* which later came into prolonged conflict with the Social-Democratic Labour Party founded by Bebel and Liebknecht; in 1875 the two organisations fused into the Socialist Party of Germany, which was later renamed Social-Democratic Party of Germany.—II 71, 89, 94, 99, 124.

LAVROV, P. L. (Mirtov, 1823–1900)—Outstanding theorist of revolutionary Narodnik school. Member of Zemlya i Volya in the sixties; arrested and deported; while in exile wrote *Historic Letters,* a book which exerted tremendous influence upon the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia, and in which the basic principles of the "Russian subjective school in sociology" were laid down; action of "critically thinking individuals" as determining factor of social progress. In 1870 Lavrov escaped abroad. Took part in the Paris Commune. Published (in Zurich, then in London) *Vperyod,* advocating the necessity of "going among the people" for thorough propaganda and Socialist educational work, in opposition to Bakuninists, who believed the people ready for Socialist

revolution and advocated immediate organisation of insurrection. Editor of *Vestnik Narodnoy Voli* (1883–1886).—II 208.

LEHMANN, C.—Physician, Social-Democrat, member of Munich branch of the German party; aided the *Iskra* when it was edited in that city.—I 94.

LEROY-BEAULIEU, A. (1842–1912)—French economist and historian. Author, *Socialisme et démocratie* (1892), *Le Christianisme et Socialisme* (1905), *L'Empire des tsars et les Russes*.—I 129.

LIEBIG, J. (1803–1873)—Renowned German chemist; worked chiefly on application of chemistry to agriculture; his studies were highly esteemed by Marx.—I 193, 222, 226.

LIEBKNECHT, WILHELM (1826–1900)—One of the founders of German Social-Democracy. Participated in the Revolution of 1848 and was compelled to emigrate to London, where he came close to Marx and Engels. After the amnesty of 1860 he returned to Germany, where he fought first the influence of Lassalle, then of Schweitzer, Lassalle's successor and follower. At the elections of 1867, first held on the basis of universal suffrage, he was elected to Parliament. During the Franco-Prussian War, he, together with Bebel, abstained from voting military appropriations; after the overthrow of Napoleon III he voted against military appropriations. In 1872 he was accused of high treason and sentenced to two years' imprisonment. Having served his sentence, he continued activities both in Parliament and among the masses of workers; under the impediments of the anti-Socialist Law, he fought for the principles of revolutionary Social-Democracy against every attempt to deviate from them (by Vollmar, Bernstein, etc.).—I 109, 110; II 130, 160.

LORIS-MELIKOV, M. T. (1825–1888)—Minister of the Interior in 1880–1881; also chairman of the "Supreme Executive Commission to Combat the Revolutionary Movement." His appointment and his vague programme of reform were viewed as an attempt by the government to reconcile liberal opinion in the face of the growing revolutionary movement. His rule was ironically described in the Liberal press as "dictatorship of the heart." Shortly before the assassination of Alexander II, on March 1 (13), 1881, the government adopted his project of a consultative commission of Zemstvo representatives to assist in the drafting of legislation initiated by the government. Resigned after assassination of Alexander II.—1 136-140, 158.

LOUIS XVI (1754–1793)—King of France at the outbreak of the Great Revolution. Executed by sentence of the Convention.—I 137.

LYUBOSHCHINSKY, M. N. (1817–1889)—Liberal Senator; took part in the enactment of agrarian and judicial reforms in the sixties, and later opposed extreme reaction as member of Imperial Council.—I 132.

M

MACK, P.—East Prussian landowner; wrote on machine technique and electrification in agriculture.—I 213, 216.

MAKARY (Bulgakov, M. P.; 1816–1882)—Theologian and church historian; Metropolitan of Moscow.—II 52.

MALTHUS, T. (1766–1834)—English economist; vulgar representative of classical school; famous for his theory that poverty was due to overpopulation, arguing that population increased faster than the food supply; author of *An Essay on the Principle of Population.* Marx criticised Malthus severely, accusing him of plagiarism and of being an apologist for the ruling classes. —I 192.

MARTOV, L. (1873–1923)—Leader of Mensheviks. Participated in St. Petersburg Union of Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class. Contributed to *Iskra.* At Second Congress of R.S.-D.L.P. in 1903 headed the minority. During the war he was a Menshevik-Internationalist. Participated in the Zimmerwald Conference (Centre) and edited the pacifist *Nashe Slovo* [*Our Word*], which appeared in Paris. After the March Revolution he, together with a group of like-minded Mensheviks, returned to Russia through Germany. During the first period of the revolution, he occupied an internationalist position, disagreeing with the majority of his party, which adhered to a social-defencist policy. At the Second Soviet Congress he advocated the formation of a government consisting of representatives of all Socialist parties; when the Mensheviks and the Right Socialist-Revolutionists left the Congress, he stayed. Soon, however, he succumbed to the Menshevik influence, and later passed into the camp of the enemies of the Soviet Government. In 1920 he emigrated to Berlin, where he edited the *Sotsialistichesky Vestnik* [*Socialist Messenger*], central organ of the Mensheviks.—I 37; II 133, 144.

MARTYNOV, A. S. (Pikker; born 1865)—Member of the Narodnaya Volya in his youth, became a Social-Democrat while an exile in Siberia. Emigrated in 1900, joined the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad; editor of *Rabocheye Dyelo;* as a theorist of Economism, he was sharply criticised by Lenin. At second congress of the party, joined the Mensheviks and became one of their leaders and a contributor to the *Iskra* when edited under Menshevik auspices, and to leading Menshevik publications in subsequent years. During the war held a vacillating position; close to Martov's group. After November Revolution gradually moved to the Left; now a member of C.P.S.U. —II 69, 84, 136, 138, 139, 142-149, 151, 153, 155, 156, 158, 160, 161, 163, 164, 169, 181, 185, 188, 234, 240, 246, 249, 254, 257.

MARX, KARL (1818–1883)—One of the foremost thinkers of the nineteenth century; founder of scientific Socialism and dialectical materialism. "Marx continued and completed, genius-fashion, the three main spiritual tendencies of the nineteenth century represented by the three foremost countries of humanity: classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, and French Socialism" [Lenin]. *Cf.* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. XVIII; also D. Riazanov, *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels,* and *Marx: Man, Thinker and Revolutionist,* a collection of essays edited by Riazanov.—I 19, 162, 185, 189, 191-201, 205, 207, 214, 225, 226, 254; II 71, 89, 95, 109, 110, 115, 129, 160, 240.

MASLOV, P. P. (born 1867)—Well-known Menshevik economist, specialist in agrarian questions. At the Stockholm Congress of the R.S.-D.L.P. in 1906, he advanced an opportunist agrarian programme ("municipalisation" of the land), which was adopted with Plekhanov's amendment as against Lenin's programme of "nationalisation." In 1907 he worked in the Social-Democratic fraction of the Second Duma as an "expert." During the years of reaction he

was in the extreme Right Wing of the Liquidators. During the war he occupied an imperialist position, adducing queer Marxist arguments to prove the necessity for the Russian proletariat of complete victory over Germany. His book, *The Agrarian Question*, clearly reveals a revisionist tendency. At present professor in Moscow University.—I 201, 213.

MAURICE—French economist; "critic" of Marx.—I 280.

MEHRING, F. (1846–1919)—Outstanding revolutionary Marxist; historian and journalist; belonged to the Left Wing of the German Social-Democratic Party; fought against revisionism and opportunism; editor of *Leipziger Volkszeitung*, organ of the Left; editor of *Neue Zeit*, with Kautsky. During the war, Zimmerwaldian; one of the leaders of Spartacus group. Author of: *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie* (four volumes), *Die Lessing-Legende*, etc. Editor, *Der literarische Nachlass von Marx, Engels und Lassalle* (four volumes), consisting of early writings by Marx and Engels, including the *Heilige Familie*, Marx's doctoral dissertation, etc.—II 131.

MESHCHERSKY, V. P. (1839–1914)—Prince; editor of *Gazhdanin*, ultra-reactionary magazine; close to imperial court; one of inspirers of reactionary policies of Alexander III and Nicholas II.—II 166.

MIKHAILOV, A. D. (1855–1884)—Prominent member of Zemlya i Volya and of Narodnaya Volya, member of Executive Committee of the latter, organiser of the party, and leader of its terrorist activities. Arrested in 1880, sentenced to death; sentence commuted to forced labour for life. Died in Peter and Paul fortress.—II 212.

MIKHAILOV, M. I. (1826–1865)—Publicist, poet, and translator; took part in revolutionary movement of the sixties; collaborated in Chernyshevsky's *Sovremennik;* sentenced to forced labour in 1861 for proclamation "To the Young Generation."—I 124.

MIKHAILOV, N. N.—Physician; agent-provocateur; betrayed Social-Democratic organisation in St. Petersburg in 1895; killed by revolutionists in 1905. —II 119.

MIKHAILOVSKY, N. C. (1842–1904)—Outstanding theorist of Narodnik school; spiritual leader of Russian intelligentsia in eighties and nineties; formulated a theory of historical process of his own. One of the editors of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, influential Narodnik magazine (1869–1884); in the early eighties belonged to the Narodnaya Volya, wrote and edited its publications. From 1894, editor of *Russkoye Bogatstvo;* led a fierce attack against Marxists. The Socialists-Revolutionists regard him, together with Lavrov, as the founder of their party doctrine.—I 222; II 48.

MILLERAND, A. (born 1859)—French politician; gradually evolved from Socialism to bourgeois reaction. First Socialist to join a bourgeois cabinet (1899–1902), where he sat with General Gallifet, the suppressor of the Paris Commune, thus afforded a practical illustration of Bernsteinism, which gave rise to violent controversies, both within the French party and on an international scale. Expelled from party in 1904; formed, together with several other former Socialists and future bourgeois ministers (Briand, Viviani, etc.),

a party of Independent Socialists. President of the French Republic (1920–1924); extreme reactionary; virtual leader of French Fascism.—II 95, 252.

MILYUTIN, D. A. (1816–1896)—Count; War Minister under Alexander II; resigned after the Tsar's assassination in 1881, together with Loris-Melikov. —I 149.

MILYUTIN, N. A. (1818–1872)—Liberal high official under Alexander II; Assistant Minister of the Interior from 1859; in charge of the preparation of the peasant emancipation act; after its enactment resigned together with Count Lanskoy; in 1864 took part in the enactment of agrarian reform in Poland. Author of a number of statistical works.—I 123, 129, 149.

MOST, J. (1846–1906)—Originally German Social-Democrat. Bookbinder by trade. In 1869 sentenced to five years' imprisonment for high treason; soon amnestied and deported from Germany. Published in London the *Freiheit;* sharply attacked the policies of German Social-Democracy, and was expelled from the party. Went to New York and joined the Anarchists, playing a considerable rôle in the radical wing of the labour movement.—II 99, 131, 196.

MÜHLBERGER—German Social-Democrat; follower of Proudhon; criticised by Engels for articles on housing problem; contributed to Höchberg's *Zukunft,* organ of the Right Wing of the party; sharply attacked by Bebel.—I 229; II 99.

MYSHKIN, I. N. (1848–1885)—Prominent revolutionist in the Narodnik movement of the seventies. Tried in 1877 ("Trial of the 193"); sentenced to ten years of forced labour; shot for insult to prison warden.—II 182, 212.

N

N. N.—*See* Prokopovich, S. N.

NADEZHDIN, L. (E. O. Zelensky, died 1905)—Social-Democrat. Emigrated in 1900; founded in 1900 in Switzerland the *Svoboda* (Freedom) group, combining Social-Democratic programme with terrorist tactics. His abilities as a publicist, sharp opposition to "legal" Marxism and Bernsteinism, and sympathies with "political" trend in labour movement as opposed to Economism, caused the *Iskra* and Lenin, in particular, to endeavour to secure his collaboration. No agreement with him was reached, however.—II 225, 227, 231, 233, 235-237, 241-245.

NAPOLEON III—Emperor of France from 1852 to 1870; evaluated by Marx in his *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.*—I 165.

NARYSHKIN—Big landowner, one of leaders of extreme Right in Imperial Council after Revolution of 1905.—I 93.

NICHOLAS I—Tsar of Russia from 1825 to 1855.—I 125; II 51.

NICHOLAS II—Last Tsar of Russia. (1894–1917). Executed in 1918. I 148-150; II 52, 61, 63.

NIKANOR (Kamensky, N. T.; 1847–1910)—Bishop; writer on church problems.—II 48.

NIKITENKO, A. V. (1804–1877)—Professor of Russian literature and censor; politically a "moderate progressive." His diary, published posthumously, is of special interest for the history of his time and for that of censorship in Russia.—I 123.

NIKOLAI-ON—Pseudonym of N. F. Danielson (1844–1918), economist of the eighties and nineties. One of the most prominent spokesmen of the Narodnik school. First translator of Marx's *Capital* into Russian; was for some time regarded by the Russian public at large as representative of Marxism; corresponded with Marx and Engels. Author of *Essays on Our National Economy since the Reforms,* which, together with V. V.'s works, constituted the principal exposition of Narodnik economic theories. His views were repeatedly subjected to critical analysis by Lenin.—II 36.

NIKON (1605–1681)—Patriarch of the Russian Church; the reform enacted by him caused the schism in the Church.—II 51.

NOBEL, L. (1831–1888)—Swede by origin; oil operator in Baku; founded in 1874 "Nobel Brothers Ltd.," one of the biggest oil concerns in Russia. —I 173.

O

OBOLENSKY, I. M.—Prince; governor of Kherson and Kharkov; in 1901 suppressed by every means public efforts to aid famine victims; became famous in 1902 by brutal repression of peasant risings in South Russia.—II 13-16.

OBRUCHEV, V. A. (1835–1912)—Retired officer of the General Staff; contributor to Chernyshevsky's *Sovremennik;* took part in opposition movement of the sixties; spent thirteen years in Siberia for distribution of a revolutionary proclamation. Later withdrew from political activities.—I 124.

OM.—Contributor to *Priazovsky Krai.*—II 25.

OWEN, ROBERT (1771–1858)—English Utopian Socialist; active propagandist of social reforms; advocate of peaceful action; opposed the workers' political movement of his days (Chartism). Is regarded as spiritual father of English co-operative movement. Came to America for a time, where Owenite colonies, New Harmony and others, had been founded.—II 111.

OZEROV, I. K. (born 1869)—Economist, professor at Moscow University; supported Zubatrov's policies in regard to the labour movement.—II 190, 191, 194.

P

PANTELEYEV, L. F. (born 1840)—Writer. In 1865 sentenced to forced labour for membership in Zemlya i Volya and for serving as intermediary between Russian and Polish revolutionists. In 1905 was close to Cadet Party. Author of memoirs on the political movements of the sixties.—I 125, 126.

PARVUS (A. L. Helfand, 1869–1924)—Russian political emigrant who by the end of the nineties began to work in the German Social-Democracy as a Left Winger. Well-known Marxian theoretician, author of a number of works dealing with world economy. Participated in the 1905 Revolution in Russia; developed the theory of "permanent revolution." During the war he was an

extreme social chauvinist and agent of German imperialism; published a magazine, *Die Glocke*.—I 94; II 254.

PASTEUR, L. (1822–1895)—Great French chemist and bacteriologist; discovered origin of disease in germs; Pasteurisation based on his discoveries. —I 222.

PERELS, E. (1837–1893)—Specialist on construction of agricultural machinery; taught at Berlin, Halle, and Vienna; author of several books.—I 204.

PEROVSKAYA, S. L. (1854–1881)—Prominent revolutionist. Carried on Narodnik propaganda among peasants in the seventies; spent several years in prison; tried in 1877 ("Trial of the 193"). Played leading part in the Narodnaya Volya and in assassination of Alexander II in 1881. Executed together with Zhelyabov and others.—II 212.

PETER I—Tsar of Russia (1682–1725).—II 51, 52.

PETER III—Tsar of Russia (1728–1762).—II 52.

PHILARET (Drozdov, V. M.; 1783–1867)—Metropolitan of Moscow from 1826; very influential in government spheres; extreme reactionary and opponent of peasant emancipation; by order of Alexander II edited the emancipation manifesto.—II 50, 52.

PISAREV, D. I. (1840–1868)—Radical critic and publicist, whose articles greatly contributed to the formation of the revolutionary ideology of the intelligentsia of the sixties. One of the editors of the magazine *Russkoye Slovo*. In 1862 sentenced to five years confinement in a fortress for issuing an illegal proclamation.—II 240.

PLEKHANOV, G. V. (1856–1918)—Founder of Russian Marxism and one of the main theoreticians of the Second International. With the beginning of the World War, he took an extreme social chauvinist position, advocating class truce; together with Alexinsky and the Right Socialists-Revolutionists he published a magazine, *Prizyv*, in Paris, counselling the Russian workers to refrain from strikes and to give up their struggle against tsarism in order to win a victory over Germany. After the March Revolution he published a paper, *Yedinstvo* in Petrograd, advocating war to victory and abstention from class-struggle. After the November Revolution the Plekhanovists fought bitterly against the Soviet Government. Plekhanov himself was undecided in the last few months of his life, and while an opponent of the Soviet Government he stated that "one must not take up arms against the working class even if it is mistaken." The Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow is now publishing his collected works which will make up twenty-odd volumes.—I 23*ff*, 28*ff*, 34, 36, 37, 43, 46, 65, 66, 109, 298; II 98, 127, 132, 146, 148, 181, 182, 183, 212, 240, 253.

POBYEDONOSTSEV, C. P. (1827–1907)—Procurator of the Holy Synod; inspirer of the reaction of the eighties; virtual head of the government under Alexander III; continued to exert great influence under Nicholas II until the Revolution of 1905.—II 52.

POTRESOV, A. N. (Starover; born 1869)—Social-Democrat. One of the participants of the St. Petersburg Union of Struggle for the Liberation of the

Working Class. Banished in 1898 to Northern Russia; afterwards emigrated and became member editorial staff of *Iskra*. Participated in the Second Congress R.S.-D.L.P. in 1903. After the split, he became one of the Menshevik leaders. Subsequently led the extremist Right Wing of the Mensheviks-Liquidators. During the war he was the most consistent representative of social-patriotism among the Mensheviks. Lives abroad at present, occupying a position to the Right of the official Mensheviks.—I 23, 25*ff*, 32, 35, 67-69; II 101.

PREOBRAZHENSKY, I.—Author of an open letter to Archbishop of Kharkov against the official Church, published in 1901.—II 51.

PRINGSHEIM, O.—German economist; contributor to Brauns' *Archiv* on questions relating to application of electricity in agriculture.—I 213, 215.

PROKOPOVICH, S. N. (born 1871)—Economist and publicist; for a time member of the League of Russian Social-Democrats, Economist of the extreme Right; soon withdrew from Social-Democracy and joined Liberal Emancipation League. In 1906, member of Central Committee of Cadet Party; later, "to the Left of the Cadets." Editor of *Bez Zaglaviya*, radical magazine. In 1917, Minister of Food Supply in the Kerensky government. Author of a number of books on labour and social problems, which he treated from the bourgeois-democratic standpoint. Now an émigré.—II 104, 124, 186.

PROUDHON (1809-1865)—One of the first theorists of Anarchism; reflected ideology of the petty-bourgeoisie. Tracing the cause of the evils of capitalism to the present form of commodity exchange, Proudhon advocated a utopian system of social organisation on the basis of "mutualism" (mutual exchange of services) through the securing of gratuitous credit and the establishment of exchange banks and with the maintenance of small private property. Author, *Système des contradictions économiques Qu'est-ce que la propriété?*, etc. Marx's *Poverty of Philosophy* was devoted to the criticism of his views.—I 229; II 123.

R

RADISHCHEV, A. N. (1749-1802)—Writer. One of the advanced liberals of the time of Empress Catherine II. Was the first to come out against serfdom in his book *Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow*, for which he was sentenced to death; upon commutation, was exiled to Siberia for ten years. In 1801, upon his return, was appointed to Law Drafting Commission; recommended immediate abolition of serfdom and legal equality for all classes; threatened by another deportation, committed suicide.—I 127.

RANKE—German economist; professor; adherent of the *Kathedersozialismus* or Socialism of the Chair. Took part in the investigations of condition of peasants in Germany conducted in the eighties by the *Verein für Sozialpolitik*. —I 250.

RESHETNIKOV, F. M. (1841-1871)—Narodnik writer. Author of realistic sketches from peasant life, which had considerable influence upon radical intelligentsia.—I 89.

RICARDO, D. (1772-1823)—English banker; most prominent theorist of classical political economy; author of *Political Economy*.—I 191, 192.

RICHTER, E. (1838-1906)—Leader of German "Freethinking" Party, the party of liberal bourgeoisie; member of Reichstag; bitter opponent of Socialism; his anti-Socialist propaganda brought forth repeated retorts, oral and written, from the German Social-Democrats, and from Bebel in particular. —I 221, 222.

RITTINGHAUSEN, M. (1814-1890)—German Social-Democrat. In 1848, contributor to Marx's *Neue Rheinische Zeitung;* in seventies and eighties, Social-Democratic member of Reichstag; in 1884 withdrew from party. His advocacy of direct legislation by the people gave rise to controversies in the party; criticized by Kautsky.—II 214.

R. M.—Author of article "Our Reality," printed as appendix to *Rabochaya Mysl* of September 1899.—I 151, 152; II 130, 144, 149, 184, 249.

R. N. S.—*See* Struve, P. B.

ROBESPIERRE, M. (1758-1794)—Jacobin. One of the leaders of French Revolution in 1789; inspirer and head of the dictatorship of the petty-bourgeoisie in 1792-1794. Was at the head of the Committee of Public Safety, the revolutionary government established by the National Convention, which used terrorist methods to destroy the enemies of the Jacobin republic. As a result of his break with the extreme Left and the execution of its leaders, he became isolated and fell on the ninth of Thermidor (July 28, 1794), a victim of the anti-Jacobin bloc. His execution marked the beginning of counter-revolution in France.—II 47.

RODBERTUS-JAGETZOW, K. (1805-1875)—Big Prussian landowner; economist; one of principal theorists of "State Socialism" called by Marx "Prussian-Junker" Socialism.—I 197.

RODZYANKO, M. V. (1859–1924)—Very large landowner in many provinces. Chairman Fourth Imperial Duma; Octobrist. After March Revolution Chairman Provisional Committee Imperial Duma. Very active organiser of bourgeois reaction under Kerensky. Emigrated after November Revolution.—II 43.

ROGACHEV, D. M. (1856-1884)—Prominent member of Narodnaya Volya, took leading part in terrorist activities and in revolutionary organisation among officers. Executed.—II 212.

ROTHSCHILD, M. A. (1743-1812)—Founder of the famous banking firm, now having branches in Paris, London, Vienna, Frankfurt, etc.—I 221; II 78.

ROZHDESTVENSKY, P.—Chairman of the congress of missionaries of Oryol diocese in 1901.—II 49.

RUGE, A. (1802-1880)—German writer. Active participant in revolutionary movement in 1848-1849. Literary collaborator with Marx, *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* (1843). While an emigrant in London, founded, with Ledru-Rollin, Mazzini and others, the European Revolutionary Committee. Upon returning to Germany, supported Bismarck's policy, advocated in the press German unity under Prussian hegemony.—II 71.

RYABUSHINSKY, P. P. (born 1871)—Big Moscow capitalist and banker;

leader of Associated Industries; at the second All-Russian Congress of Industrialists in 1917, advocated strangling the Revolution "by the gaunt hand of famine." Now living in Paris; active counter-revolutionist.—I 174.

RYMARENKO—Member of Zemlya i Volya. Arrested in 1862, with Chernyshevsky and N. Serno-Solovyevich.—I 126.

S

SAINT-SIMON (1760-1825)—Great French Utopian Socialist. Advocated transformation of society based upon private property and class struggle into one founded upon association, by means of government reforms and education in the spirit of a new religion; Saint-Simonism subsequently degenerated into a mystic religious sect.—II 111.

SALTYKOV, M. E. (1826-1889)—Great Russian satirist; pseudonym, N. Shchedrin. Editor, with Nekrasov, of *Otechestvenniye Zapiski*, the best radical Narodnik magazine, from 1868 to its suppression in 1884. His work is a protest against the surviving spirit of serfdom, the rule of the nobility and of bureaucracy, liberal self-complacency. The first to describe the promoters of primary capitalist accumulation in Russia.—II 205.

SAVINKOV, B. V. (1879-1925)—Prominent Socialist-Revolutionist. Began revolutionary career as Social-Democrat. In 1901 was arrested and deported to Vologda. His article "The Labour Movement in St. Petersburg and the Practical Problems of Social Democracy" (*Rabocheye Dyelo*, No. 6) impressed Lenin by its "sincerity and keenness." While in exile, became a Narodnik and joined the Socialist-Revolutionists. In 1903 joined the terrorist organisation of the Socialist-Revolutionist Party, headed by the agent-provocateur Azef; took active part in assassination of Minister Plehve (1904) and of Grand-Duke Sergey (1905). Even when a sincere revolutionist, his activity was never free of elements of gambling and adventure seeking. During the reaction that followed the Revolution of 1905, he wrote several novels from revolutionary life under the pseudonym of V. Ropshin, betraying a spirit of mysticism and disappointment in revolutionary activities. During the war, defencist, contributor to patriotic papers. In the summer of 1917, government Commissar at Headquarters, Assistant War Minister under Kerensky; acted as intermediary between General Kornilov and Kerensky and actively aided Kornilov in his attempted counter-revolutionary coup. After November Revolution, active enemy of Soviet Government, organiser of White Guard conspiracies and insurrections; later emigrated. In 1924 arrested while crossing the Soviet frontier. When on trial renounced opposition to Soviet Government. Sentenced to imprisonment for ten years. Committed suicide in 1925.—II 181, 201-203, 205.

SCHIEMANN, T. (1847-1921)—German historian; professor at Berlin University.—I 128.

SCHIPPEL, M. (born 1859)—German Social-Democrat; revisionist; contributor to *Sozialistische Monatshefte*.—I 220.

SCHRAMM, K.—German Social-Democrat; opportunist; contributor to Höchberg's *Zukunft* and *Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*.—II 131.

SCHULZE-DELITZSCH, H. (1808-1883)—German petty-bourgeois politician; advocated organisation of co-operative associations to secure economic inde-

pendence of artisans and small producers in general, and of workers as well. Adhered to Bastiat's theory of "economic harmonies"; was criticised by Lassalle.—II 123.

SCHWEITZER, J. B. VON (1833-1875)—Leader of Lassalleans in the sixties. After Lassalle's death (1864), editor of *Sozialdemokrat;* supported Bismarck's policy of uniting Germany under Prussian leadership, which caused break between him and Marx and Engels. In 1867 became head of Lassallean Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein, was vested by the members with dictatorial powers, fought stubbornly against the Eisenachians, headed by Bebel and Liebknecht. Only his withdrawal from the labour movement in 1871 made possible the union of the two factions.—II 130.

SEREBRYAKOV, E.—Narodnik-revolutionist. Joined the Zemlya i Volya while an army officer. Lived for many years abroad as an exile; editor of revolutionary publications; writer on history of revolutionary movement. Joined Socialist-Revolutionist Party, in which he belonged to the extreme Right. —II 212.

SERNO-SOLOVYEVICH, A. A. (1838-1869)—Revolutionist of the sixties; emigrated in 1862 and was banished forever from Russia; while abroad, joined the Left Wing of revolutionary emigration; came out against Herzen; took part in the work of First International.—I 126.

SERNO-SOLOVYEVICH, N. A. (1832-1866)—Revolutionist of the sixties. In 1859 went abroad and established close connections with Herzen and his group. In 1861 published in Berlin a pamphlet criticising the peasant emancipation act as inadequate; also drafted a project of constitution to be submitted to Alexander II. Upon returning to Russia joined the Zemlya i Volya. In 1862 was arrested and sentenced to twelve years of forced labour, commuted to exile to Siberia for life; died in exile.—I 126, 128.

SEUFFERHELD, A.—German landowner; author of several articles describing his experiments in the application of electricity in agriculture.—I 213.

SHAKHOVSKOY, N. V. (1856-1906)—Prince. Censor. Author of several books on problems of rural economics.—I 244.

SHCHEDRIN, N.—*See* Saltykov, M. E.

SHUVALOV, A. P. (1816-1876)—Count. Moderate liberal. Author of a number of articles on agriculture.—I 132.

SIPYAGIN, D. S. (1853-1902)—Minister of the Interior from 1899; one of most reactionary bureaucrats; distinguished himself by repressions against workers, peasants, students, Zemstvos. Assassinated in 1902 by the student S. Balmashev.—I 146, 291, 294, 296, 297, 303, 304.

SKVORTSOV, A. I. (1848-1914)—Bourgeois economist; professor. Author of several works on agricultural economics.—I 189.

SKVORTSOV, V. M. (born in 1859)—Representative of militant Russian clergy, famous for his extreme reactionary spirit and close association with the police; editor of *Kolokol,* a black-hundred paper, in 1906.—II 48.

SOLARI—Italian chemist.—I 222.

SPRENGER—German economist; author, *Die Lage der Landwirtschaft in Baden* (1894).—I 255.

STAKHOVICH, M. A. (born 1861)—Zemstvo leader, moderate liberal; belonged first to Cadet Party, later was one of organisers of Octobrist Party, formed after the 1905 Revolution by representatives of the big bourgeoisie; member of First and Second Dumas. After March Revolution of 1917 was appointed Governor-General of Finland, and later, representative of the Provisional Government abroad.—I 90, 93; II 47-50, 82, 85.

STAROVER—*See* Potresov, A. N.

STOLBOVSKY, R. Z. (died 1867)—Member of commission appointed to investigate the causes of fires in St. Petersburg in May 1862, which the Government exploited to combat the revolutionary movement.—I 126.

STRUVE, N. A.—Wife of P. B. Struve; took part in his negotiations with *Iskra* in 1900-1901.—I 67.

STRUVE, P. B. (born 1870)—Russian economist and publicist; Social-Democrat in the nineties, representative of the so-called "legal Marxism." Later became Liberal and editor of an illegal Liberal magazine abroad. After the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, he become leader of the Right Wing of the Cadets. Nationalist. Fought actively against the Revolution after November, 1917. Minister of the "cabinets" of Denikin and Wrangel. At present lives abroad, publishing a magazine with monarchist inclinations.—I 24, 26, 41, 67, 146-153, 156-161, 186, 189, 208, 224, 225, 261; II 87, 243, 249.

STUMPFE, E. (born 1866)—High official of the Department of Public Domain in Germany; writer on agricultural questions.—I 204.

SUVORIN, A. S. (1834-1910)—Journalist. Started as Liberal; later, editor of the most influential organ of the conservative nobility, the *Novoye Vremya*, a typical expression of subserviency to the ruling bureaucracy, strongly anti-Semitic.—II 48.

T

THIEL, H. (born 1839)—Professor of agricultural economics at Berlin; editor, *Landwirtschaftliche Jahrbücher*.—I 239.

TIKHOMIROV, L. A. (born 1850)—Member of Executive Committee of Narodnaya Volya; took part in several attempts upon the life of Alexander II; theorist of the party and editor of its publications; later, a renegade, pardoned by the tsarist government, apostle of autocracy and of the Orthodox Church, editor of semi-official papers (*Moskovskiye Vyedomosti* and other).—I 134, 138.

TKACHEV, P. N. (1844-1885)—Revolutionist; prosecuted in 1869 in the affair of the revolutionist Nechayev; emigrated in 1873; published in Geneva the *Nabat;* outstanding representative of Russian Jacobinism, advocated seizure of power by revolutionary minority for the purpose of Socialist reorganisation

of society. His views had some influence upon the transformation of the Narodnik movement from pure propaganda into political struggle and upon the ideas of Narodnaya Volya. Wrote also, under various pseudonyms, in legal radical publications, sometimes expressing views approaching those of historical materialism.—II 241, 242.

TOLSTOY, D. A. (1823-1889)—Procurator of the Holy Synod, Minister of Public Education, Minister of the Interior, from 1882. Enforced rigid policy of repression of Liberal and revolutionary movements; did away almost completely with independence of Zemstvos.—I 142.

TOLSTOY, L. N. (1828–1910)—The great writer, who, in his novels, drew a vast picture of the life of the landowning gentry and partly of the peasantry; violent critic of feudal-bourgeois society, the state, the Church, the family, the prevailing morals, to which he opposed, as an ideal, an anarchic society based on patriarchal peasant life "in truth." In spite of its radical opposition to the existing social order, the Tolstoyan school was, by its propaganda of non-resistance and of individual perfection, one of the forms of the reaction of the eighties and nineties and was essentially anti-revolutionary.—I 224.

TUGAN-BARANOVSKY, M. I. (1865-1919)—Prominent "legal Marxist"; soon became one of the "critics of Marx" and, later, a Liberal. Fought, together with Struve, in the first skirmishes with the Narodniks. Author, *Industrial Crises in Modern England* (1894). In 1898 published his chief work, *The Russian Factory in the Past and the Present*, where he criticised the Narodnik views of the development of capitalism in Russia. Later formulated a "theory of crises" of his own, which became popular among "critics of Marx" and bourgeois economists. In 1905 and subsequent years belonged to Cadet Party; during the civil war of 1918-1919 was a member of the Ukrainian anti-Soviet Government.—I 26, 186, 208.

TULIN, K.—One of Lenin's pseudonyms.—II 103.

TURGENEV, I. S. (1818–1883)—Famous Russian writer; a number of characters in his novels belonged to what was termed "superfluous people," dissatisfied with the existing order, yet lacking the ability to work for its transformation; reflected the growth of the spirit of protest among the democratic intelligentsia; in *Fathers and Sons* gave a striking picture of a "Nihilist"; in *Virgin Soil* attempted to describe the life of revolutionists. Politically he was a consistent "Westerner," yet did not go in his demands beyond moderate political reforms.—I 128; II 16.

TWIN—*See* Struve, P. B.

U

UNKOVSKY, A. M. (1828-1892)—Liberal marshal of Tver nobility; active in the preparation of the peasant emancipation reform; author of one of the most liberal projects of emancipation; leader of the opposition movement caused by the government interdiction to discuss peasant emancipation at the Assembly of the Nobility; was removed from his post in 1859 and exiled to Vyatka.—I 154.

Uspensky, G. I. (1840-1902)—Narodnik writer; described Russian life in the period that followed the reforms of the sixties. Outstanding features in his works are the contrasts between the crumbling framework of old social relations and the advance of youthful, voracious capitalism, and the vain search for harmony between the intelligentsia, consumed with the desire to "pay its debt to the people," and the people itself, whose traditional "harmonious" mode of living was breaking down.—I 89.

Ustimovich—Marshal of the Poltava nobility; drafted the project of a petition for a constitution in 1879.—I 141.

V

Vahlteich, K. (born 1839)—German Socialist; one of the founders of Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein; member of Reichstag; at time of anti-Socialist laws in Germany emigrated to America and settled in Chicago. —II 99.

Valuyev, P. A. (1814-1890)—Count. One of most prominent men in politics under Alexander II; Minister of the Interior, of Public Domain, Chairman of Committee of Ministers. Combined theoretical liberalism with adherence to old methods of repression in practice. Author of two projects of constitution. The Zemstvos and the mitigated press régime were introduced while he was in office. Presided over commission for a thorough investigation of the condition of agriculture in Russia, created at his initiative.—I 129, 130.

Vanderbilts—Family of American railroad promoters and multi-millionaires. —I 221.

Vaneyev, A. A. (1872-1899)—Revolutionist, Social-Democrat. In 1893 formed, together with Lenin and others, the group of "old timers," which was the nucleus of the League of Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class. Arrested in 1895, in prison until 1897, exiled to Eastern Siberia, where he died from tuberculosis. While in exile, took part in the drafting of protest against the *Credo*.—II 116, 118.

Vannovsky, P. S. (1822-1904)—General; War Minister under Alexander III. In 1899 presided over commission appointed to investigate causes of students' disturbances. In 1901, after assassination of Minister of Public Education Bogolepov, appointed to succeed him. His meager reforms, though hailed by both the official and the Liberal press as marking a new era in dealing with the students, failed to allay the revolutionary movement in the universities, which caused Vannovsky to resign in 1902.—I 129, 130; II 73.

Vassilyev—Colonel. Head of the gendarmerie in Minsk; assisted Zubatov in efforts to build up a labour organisation under police auspices.—II 190.

Velika—*See* Zasulich, V. I.

Vinogradsky, S. N. (born 1856)—Prominent botanist and bacteriologist. —I 222.

Vollmar, G. von (1850-1922)—German Social-Democrat, opportunist, one of the leaders of the Right Wing.—II 96.

VOROVSKY, V. V. (1871-1923)—One of most prominent members of Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Joined revolutionary movement in 1890. Exiled to Vyatka province in 1899. Strongly opposed Bernsteinism. In 1902 went abroad; contributed to *Iskra*. Since second congress of 1903, active Bolshevik, editor and contributor to Bolshevist publications; repeatedly arrested. In 1917, member of Foreign Bureau of Central Committee of party; after November Revolution, Soviet Minister in Sweden, Ambassador in Italy; representative at Lausanne Conference in 1922, where he was assassinated by the monarchist Conradi.—II 243.

V. V. (V. P. Vorontsov) (1847-1917)—Outstanding theorist of Narodnik school in the eighties and nineties. Author of a number of books on economic questions, of which the principal is *The Fate of Capitalism in Russia* (1883). Contributed to all leading Narodnik publications, from Lavrov's *Vperyod* to Mikhaylovsky's *Russkoye Bogatstvo*, from which he withdrew in the early nineties; later wrote in the Liberal *Vestnik Evropy*. Strongly opposed Marxism and was combated by practically every one of the early Russian Marxists, by Plekhanov in particular.—II 120, 121, 127, 129, 131.

VYELEPOLSKY, A (1803-1877)—Count and Marquis. Prominent Polish leader. In 1861, in a letter to Alexander II, appealed for reforms in Poland, to avert a revolution. Appointed by Alexander II member of the Administrative Council in Poland, endeavoured to rally moderate elements, while suppressing revolutionary manifestations; his policy of conciliation with the Russian government proved a failure, and upon the outbreak of the insurrection in Poland in 1863 he resigned and went abroad.—I 139.

W

WEBB, BEATRICE (B. Potter) (born 1858)—Wife of Sidney Webb. Prominent writer on economic matters. Joint author with her husband of a number of books, including *Industrial Democracy*, translated into Russian by Lenin. —II 142, 214.

WEBB, SIDNEY (born 1859)—English economist. One of the founders of Fabian Society and its representative in the Labour Party. Member of MacDonald Cabinet in 1924 and a Labour member of the House of Lords, in 1929. —II 142, 214.

WEITLING, W. (1810-1871)—German Utopian Socialist. Tailor by trade. While traveling as a journeyman abroad, joined the Communists in Paris and began to study Babeuf, Fourier, and Cabet. Believed in attainment of Communism by peaceful means. Was delegated by Parisian League of Communists in 1840 to Geneva for propaganda purposes. After appearance of his *Evangelium des armen Sünders*, in 1843, was extradited to Baden; later went to London; returned to Germany in 1848; emigrated to America in 1849, where he published until 1854 *Republik der Arbeiter;* for several years carried on propaganda for the organisation of a Communist association; failure of his plan caused him to retire from public activities.—II 123.

WEST, E. (1782-1828)—English economist. Author of *An Essay on the Application of Capital to Land* (1815), where he anticipated Ricardo's rent theory; and *Grain Prices and Wages* (1826).—I 192.

WIFE—*See* Struve, N. A.

WILFARTH, N.—German chemist; specialist in soil bacteriology.—I 222.

WILHELM II—German Kaiser from 1888 to 1918.—I 165; II 174.

WILLE, G. (1812-1890)—German chemist; Liebig's assistant; later professor at Hessen; author of several works.—I 222.

WITTE, S. J. (1849-1915)—Most prominent of Russian ministers under Alexander III and Nicholas II. By his financial measures (introduction of the gold standard, strengthening of protective tariff, liquor monopoly) greatly contributed to progress of capitalism in Russia. Author of memoranda on Zemstvos (1898–1899), where he proved incompatibility between those institutions and autocracy. In charge of peace negotiations with Japan in 1905 at Portsmouth, N. H. Appointed Premier in 1905 to carry out policy of combating revolutionary movement by means of concessions, including institution of Imperial Duma. Author of Tsar's Manifesto of October 17 (30), 1905, which was a result of the Revolution and which granted elementary civil liberties and the establishment of a parliament (Duma) based on limited suffrage. Lost influence after defeat of Revolution of 1905.—I 62, 122, 123, 134, 140, 144-146, 148, 154, 156, 157, 160; II 76-80, 87.

WOLTMANN, L. (1871–1907)—German sociologist. Founder of *Politisch-Anthropologische Revue.* In *Die Darwinische Theorie und der Sozialismus* (1899) attempted to work out a synthesis of Socialism and Darwinism; in *Der historische Materialismus* (1900), endeavoured to reconcile Marxism and Kantian philosophy; in *Politische Anthropologie* (1903), advanced the theory of dependence of political evolution upon racial factors.—II 129.

WORMS, A. E. (born 1868)—Professor of Law at Moscow University; in 1901-1903 lectured at meetings of the Machinists' Mutual Aid Society, organised by Zubatov.—II 190.

Y

YAKOVLEVA, M.—Working woman; one of those prosecuted for disturbances at the Obukhov plant in May, 1901.—I 306, 307.

YANSON, E. (1835-1893)—Distinguished statistician; head of statistical service of the city of St. Petersburg; organiser of St. Petersburg census of 1890; author of several statistical works.—I 287.

Z

ZASULICH, VERA (1851-1919)—Famous revolutionist, who in 1878 fired a shot at the St. Petersburg Governor-General, Trepov, for ordering corporal punishment to be administered to the imprisoned revolutionist, Bogolyubov. Having been freed by the jury, she emigrated abroad, where she was one of the founders of the Emancipation of Labour group in 1883. In 1896 she represented the St. Petersburg Union of Struggle at the International Socialist Congress. After the split between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks she joined the latter. During the war she was among the social-patriots. In 1917 she was a member of the *Yedinstvo* group.—I 24*ff*, 32*ff*, 43, 67, 69, 139; II 210, 249.

ZHELYABOV, A. I. (1851-1881)—Leader of Narodnaya Volya and chief organiser of its terrorist activities from 1879 to 1881. Joined revolutionary movement in 1873; took part in the "going among the people" movement; one of the prosecuted in the "Trial of the 193"; in 1878, at the Lipetsk conference of Zemlya i Volya, he advocated terrorist action and organised the partisans of terror into a new party, the Narodnaya Volya. Executed for part in assassination of Alexander II.—II 182, 212, 240.

ZHUKOVSKY, V. A. (1783-1852)—Russian poet of Romantic school. Tutor to children of Nicholas I.—II 52.

ZNAMENSKY, N. A.—Contributor to the reactionary *Moskovskiye Vyedomosti.* —II 44.

ZUBATOV, S. V. (1864-1917)—In the early eighties, member of revolutionary groups, whom he soon began to betray to the police. Later made head of Moscow Okhrana (secret political police). Inspirer and organiser of the "Zubatovshchina," or "Police Socialism": development of workers' organisations under police auspices, to divert them from revolutionary movement. Was removed from his post in 1903, after his organisations had become a nucleus of an elemental mass movement in a number of cities, culminating in general strikes; later was exiled to Vladimir. In 1905 again served in Police Department. Committed suicide after March Revolution of 1917.—II 65, 67, 70, 104, 124, 125, 190, 191, 194.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LIST OF BOOKS AND ARTICLES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES CITED BY LENIN IN THIS VOLUME

AUHAGEN, H., *Ueber Grossbetrieb und Kleinbetrieb in der Landwirtschaft.* (Landwirtschaftliche Jahrbücher. Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Landwirtschaft und Archiv des Königlich-Preussischen Landes-Oekonomie-Kollegiums. Herausgegeben von Dr. H. Thiel, 25. Band, Berlin 1896.) I 238.

Bäuerliche Zustände in Deutschland, Band I. *Die Grenzboten.* Zeitschrift für Politik, Literatur und Kunst, Leipzig 1883.—I 249.

BENSING, FRANZ, *Der Einfluss der landwirtschaftlichen Maschinen auf Volks-Privatwirtschaft,* Breslau 1898.—I 205.

Bibliothek russischer Denkwürdigkeiten, herausgegeben von Theodor Schiemann, Band IV. Konstantin Kavelins und Ivan Turgenyevs sozial-politischer Briefwechsel mit Alexander Herzen. Mit Beilagen und Erläuterungen herausgegeben von Prof. Michail Dragomanov. Autorisierte Uebersetzung aus dem Russischen von D. B. Minzes, Stuttgart 1894.—I 128.

DAVID, EDUARD, "Bäuerliche Barbaren," in Sozialistische Monatshefte. 3. Jg. No. 2, February, 1899, pp. 62-71.—I 207, 231.

Die deutsche Volkswirtschaft am Schlusse des 19. .Jahrhunderts. Auf Grund der Ergebnisse der Berufs-und Gewerbezählung von 1895 und nach anderen Quellen bearbeitet im Kaiserlichen Statistischen Amt, Berlin 1900.—I 282.

DITTENBERGER, Article in *Bäuerliche Zustände in Deutschland.*—I 248.

ENGELS, FRIEDRICH, *Zur Wohnungsfrage.* Separatabdruck aus dem *Volksstaat* von 1872. Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage. Höttingen-Zürich 1887.—I 229.

——— *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg,* 3. Abdruck, Leipzig 1875.—II 111.

——— *Herrn Eugen Dührings Umwälzung der Wissenschaft* (Anti-Dühring). Dritte, durchgesehene und vermehrte Auflage, Stuttgart 1894.—I 126.

——— *Vorrede zur 3. Auflage: "Der 18. Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte," von Karl Marx,* Hamburg 1885.—II 95.

Erhebungen Ueber die Lage der Landwirtschaft im Grossherzogtum Baden, 1883. I-IV.—I 252.

HECHT, N., *Drei Dörfer der badischen Hard,* Leipzig 1895.—I 231.

HERTZ, FR. O., *Die agrarischen Fragen im Verhältnis zum Sozialismus.* Mit einer Vorrede von Ed. Bernstein, Wien 1899.—I 203.

HUSCHKE, LEO, *Landwirtschaftliche Reinertragsberechnungen bei Klein-, Mittel- und Grossbetrieb, dargelegt an typischen Beispielen Mittelthüringens.* Jena 1902. In the series: *Abhandlungen des staatswissenschaftlichen Seminars zu Jena,* herausgegeben von Dr. J. Pierstorff. Band I, Heft IV.—I 248.

KAUTSKY, KARL, *Der Parlamentarismus, die Volksgesetzgebung und die Sozialdemokratie,* Stuttgart, Dietz, 1893.—II 214.

——— *Die Agrarfrage.* Eine Uebersicht über die Tendenzen der modernen Landwirtschaft und die Agrarpolitik der Sozialdemokratie. Stuttgart 1899. —I 183 *et passim.*

——— "Die Elektrizität in der Landwirtschaft" in *Die Neue Zeit,* No. 18, 1900-1901. (Vol. XX, Book I, pp. 565-572.)—I 213.

——— "Die Revision des Programms der Sozialdemokratie in Oesterreich" in

Die Neue Zeit, No. 3, October 19, 1901. (Vol. XX, Book I, pp. 68-82.) II 122.

——— "Tolstoy und Brentano" in *Die Neue Zeit*, No. 27, 1900-1901. (Vol. XIX, Book II, pp. 20-28.)—I 224.

——— "Zwei Kritiker meiner *Agrarfrage*" in *Die Neue Zeit*. (Vol. 18, Book I, 1899-1900, No. 10, pp. 292-300; No. 11, pp. 338-346; No. 12, pp. 363-368; No. 14, pp. 428-436; No. 15, pp. 47-477.)—I 220.

KLAWKI, KARL, "Ueber Konkurrenzfähigkeit des landwirtschaftlichen Kleinbetriebes." In *Landwirtschaftliche Jahrbücher*. Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Landwirtschaft und Archiv des königlich preussischen Landes-Oekonomie-Kollegiums. Herausgegeben von Dr. H. Thiel, Band 18. Berlin 1899, pp. 363-484.—I 239.

LASSALLE, FERDINAND, *Briefe von Lassalle an Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels, 1849-1862*. Stuttgart 1902.—II 71.

LEHMANN, C., and PARVUS, *Das hungernde Russland*. Reiseeindrücke, Beobachtungen und Untersuchungen. Stuttgart 1900.—I 94.

MACK, P., Der *Aufschwung unserer Landwirtschaftsbetriebe durch Verbilligung der Produktionskosten*. Eine Untersuchung über den Dienst, den Maschinentechnik und Elektrizität der Landwirtschaft bieten. Königsberg 1900. —I 213.

MARX, KARL, *Zur Kritik des Gothaer Programms* (Randglossen zum Programm der deutschen Arbeiterpartei. Written 1875, first published in the *Neue Zeit*, Vol IX, 1890-1891, Book I, No. 18.—II 109.

——— *Capital*. A Critque of Political Economy. Vol. III, Part 2, Book III. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago.—I 191, 192.

——— *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, 1926.—II 95.

——— *Theorien über den Mehrwert*. Aus dem nachgelassenen Manuskript *Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie*, herausgegeben van Karl Kautsky. Band II, David Ricardo, 2. Teil, Stuttgart 1905.—I 200.

MARX, KARL, and ENGELS, FRIEDRICH, *The Communist Manifesto*.—I 19.

MEHRING, FRANZ, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, 2. Teil, 1863-1891. Stuttgart 1898.—II 131.

PRINGSHEIM, OTTO, "Landwirtschaftliche Manufaktur und elektrische Landwirtschaft," in *Archiv für Soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik*. Zeitschrift zur Erforschung der gesellschaftlichen Zustände aller Länder in Verbindung mit einer Reihe nahmhafter Fachmänner des In- und Auslandes, herausgegeben von Dr. Heinrich Braun. 15. Band. Berlin 1900, pp. 406-418.—I 213.

RANKE, Article in *Bäuerliche Zustände in Deutschland*.—I 250.

Revue des Deux Mondes, Vol. XXXIX, June 15, 1862. Article by Charles de Mazade, "La Russie sous l'empereur Alexandre II."—I 124.

SEUFFERHELD, A., *Die Anwendung der Elektrizität in landwirtschaftlichen Betrieben, aus eigener Erfahrung mitgeteilt*. Stuttgart 1899.—I 213.

SPRENGER, *Die Lage der Landwirtschaft in Baden*. Karlsruhe 1884.—I 255.

Statistique Agricole de la France. Publiée par le ministère de l'Agriculture. Résultats généraux de l'enquête Décennale de 1892. Paris 1897.—I 188.

Statistik des deutschen Reiches. Neue Folge. Band 112. *Die Landwirtschaft im Deutschen Reich*. Nach der landwirtschaftlichen Betriebszählung vom 14. June 1895. Berlin.—I 188, 189.

Vorwärts, No. 65, June 6, 1887. Article, "Congress der Sozialdemokratie Deutschlands.—II 99.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

FROM JANUARY, 1900, TO JANUARY, 1902

1900

Further development of the economic crisis, which set in the second half of 1899. Lull in the economic struggle of the working class. Number of workers on strike, 29,000 as compared with 57,000 in 1899. Resumption of students' disturbances at the end of the year.

Struggle between two trends in Russian Social-Democracy: the Liberation of Labour group and the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad. Lenin, Martov, and Potresov return from exile. Preparatory work done for the publishing of the *Iskra;* first issue appears in December.

January. First issue of *Yuzhny Rabochy.*

Third Congress of the Bund.

January 25. P. L. Lavrov dies.

Plekhanov's pamphlet, *Vademecum for the Editors of "Rabocheye Dyelo,"* appears.

April. Second Congress of League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad. Split in the League. The Emancipation of Labour group quits the congress and starts the revolutionary organisation Social-Democrat.

April 18. First of May demonstrations in Warsaw, Vilna, Dombrovo; 10,000 in demonstration in Kharkov.

May 8. Strike of 1,000 railway workers in Krasnoyarsk.

June. Russia begins military operations in China.

The Russian government violates Finland's constitutional rights by abolition of freedom of assembly (June 14) and by decree directing transaction of official business in the Russian language (June 20).

June 12. Enactment of law depriving the Zemstvos of food supply functions and transferring these to government agencies.

Convention of various Socialist-Revolutionist groups at Kharkov, for the purpose of combining into one party.

In addition to existing Social-Democratic organisations in St. Petersburg, League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class and *Rabocheye Znamya,* two new organisations are founded, St. Petersburg Workers' Organisation and The Socialist (E. Broydo, B. Savinkov).

July 16–17. Jewish pogrom in Odessa.

July 25. Wilhelm Liebknecht dies.

August 12. Tsarist government issues note to foreign powers disclaiming any plans of annexation in China.

Four thousand workers on strike in Tiflis for two weeks.

September 10–14. International Socialist Congress at Paris.

September-October. Sporadic strike outbreaks among the miners in Donets Basin.

November 14. Fortieth anniversary of N. Mikhailovsky's literary activities; banquets in a number of cities; congratulatory addresses; forced silence of the press.

"Manifesto" of Socialist-Revolutionist Party issued.

November-December. Disturbances among Kiev students.

December 1. Hostile demonstration in Kharkov in front of the offices of the reactionary paper, *Yuzhny Kraï.*

December 11. First issue of the *Iskra* appears.

Economic crisis and unemployment grow more intense. Thirty-two thousand workers on strike. Signs of political unrest in the country. Beginning of large demonstrations.

Struggle between the *Iskra* and the Economists.

Social-Democratic papers published: *Iskra, Rabocheye Dyelo, Rabochaya Mysl, Yuzhny Rabochy, Rabochaya Gazeta* (Saratov).

December 22. Suppression of the Liberal newspaper, *Severny Kuryer.*

1901

January 11. Government order directing that 183 Kiev students shall be enlisted in the army.

Two thousand five hundred workers on strike at the Lena gold fields, Siberia.

Appearance of first issue of *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya,* published by the League of Socialists-Revolutionists (dated 1900).

January 20. Student disturbances in Moscow.

January 22–25. Two thousand workers on strike in Tambov.

February 5. Demonstration in Helsingfors.

February 9. Student disturbances in Moscow.

February 14. Bogolyepov, Minister of Public Education, fatally shot by P. V. Karpovich.

February 19. Demonstration of students and workers in Kharkov. Student demonstration in St. Petersburg. Demonstration in Byalostok.

February 23–25. Mass demonstrations in Moscow. Strikes in a number of plants. Arrests.

March 4. Student demonstration in Kazan Square, St. Petersburg. Wholesale clubbing and arrests of participants.

March 8. M. Lagovsky's attempt upon the life of Pobyedonostsev, Procurator of the Holy Synod.

March 11. Demonstration of students and workers in Kiev.

March 12. League of Writers suppressed for protest against brutal police treatment of participants of demonstration on March 4.

Student unrest and "disturbances" in all university cities. Mass demonstrations with participation of workers. Suspension of "Provisional Regulations" which prescribed enlistment in the army of striking university students. General Vannovsky appointed Minister of Public Education.

Unrest and riots in a number of cities in the South, caused by unemployment and want of the masses; raids on stores, scrambles with police, etc.

Strike of 3,000 workers in Yaroslavl.

April 14. First of May demonstrations in Vilna.

April 15. First of May demonstrations in Warsaw and Lodz.

Fourth congress of the Bund.

On the eve of May 1, wholesale arrests all over Russia, to prevent May Day celebration.

April 18 (May 1, new style). May Day demonstrations in Dvinsk; demonstration attempted in Kovno.

April 22. May Day demonstration in Tiflis.

May 1. May Day strikes in St. Petersburg. Demonstrations attempted in Kharkov and Kiev.

May 7. Riots at Obukhov Works, St. Petersburg; workers resist police and troops.

Machinists' Mutual Aid Society organised in Moscow under Zubatov's auspices. Zubatov's agents develop activities in North-West cities.

Suppression of *Zhizn*, Marxist monthly.

May 30. Disturbances at Baltic Shipbuilding Works, St. Petersburg.

June 8. Enactment of law allotting state lands in Siberia to private settlers.

Disturbances among peasants in Vilna Province.

Strike of railway shop workers in Saratov.

Illegal conference of Zemstvo leaders (in Russia).

Geneva conference of Social-Democratic organisations abroad (*Iskra* and *Rabocheye Dyelo* groups).

June 29. New rules relating to compulsory military service introduced in Finland.

Appearance of first issue of *Vestnik Russkoy Revolutsii*, magazine of Socialists-Revolutionists, published in Geneva.

Strike of railway shop workers in Tambov.

Nicholas II visits France.

August 17. Circular of the Minister of the Interior to the governors of provinces affected by the famine, designed to concentrate relief work in the hands of bureaucrats, barring private and civic initiative.

September 21–22. "Unity" Congress of Social-Democratic organisations abroad at Zurich.

Organisation of Foreign League of Revolutionary Social-Democracy.

September 30. Agreement between St. Petersburg organisations of the *Iskra* and of the Union of Struggle.

Unrest among students.

November 7. Demonstration in Nizhni-Novgorod in connection with the deportation of Gorky.

Unrest among students; meetings, proclamations, strikes.

November 18. Student demonstration in Moscow.

November 22. "Provisional Regulations" granting the students "right" of assembly under police supervision fail to "calm" students. Disturbances continue.

November 29–December 1. Demonstrations of workers and students in Kharkov.

December 15. Demonstration of workers and students in Yekaterinoslav.

December 17. International Socialist Conference at Brussels.

1902

January 16. Newspaper *Rossiya*, suppressed for printing Amfiteatrov's feuilleton "Messrs. Obmanov," parodying the Romanov family.

EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF V. I. LENIN

FROM JANUARY, 1900, TO JANUARY, 1902

1900

January 30. Lenin leaves the village of Shushenskoye, Siberia, for European Russia.

January-February. Lenin's article "Capitalism in Agriculture" appears in Nos. 1-2 of the magazine *Zhizn.*

February. On the way from exile to Pskov, Lenin stops for a few days in Ufa; meets Social-Democrats (Krokhmal, Svidersky, Tsurupa) and Narodniks (Aptekman, Chetverikov), living in that city. N. Krupskaya stays in Ufa to complete her term of exile.

End of February. Meeting in Moscow between Lenin and K. Lalayants, member of Yekaterinoslav Committee, empowered by Social-Democratic organisations of South Russia to negotiate with Lenin's group over the latter's participation in the organisation of a "second" convention of the party.

February 26. Lenin arrives in Pskov. While in Pskov, Lenin establishes connections and starts negotiations with various Social-Democratic groups and individual Social-Democrats in other cities, to secure their support for the projected *Iskra.*

Beginning of March. Meeting in St. Petersburg between Lenin and V. I. Zasulich, who has lived illegally in Russia to ascertain the attitude of Russian Social-Democratic organisations on the matters which were causing a struggle between two factions in the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad. Negotiations between Lenin and Zasulich in regard to the founding of the *Iskra.*

March. Meeting in Pskov between Lenin and T. Kopelson ("Grisha," "Timofey"), secretary of the League of Russian Social-Democrats, who had been touring Russia to call on Social-Democratic committees in connection with the plans for a second congress of the party.

L. Martov arrives in Pskov.

The Emancipation of Labour group appoints Lenin as its delegate to the proposed second congress of the party.

Lenin writes the original draft of the Declaration by the Editorial Board of the *Iskra.*

Lenin takes part in the so-called "Pskov Conference" between the revolutionary Marxists (Lenin, Martov, Potresov, S. I. Radchenko) and Legal Marxists (Struve, Tugan-Baranovsky); discussion of the editorial Declaration; the Legal Marxists agree to support the *Iskra.*

After the Pskov Conference, Potresov, by agreement with Lenin, leaves for Germany to make preparations for the publication of the *Iskra* and the *Zarya.*

April. Lenin attends a meeting (in Pskov) of the local revolutionary and Liberal intelligentsia (A. Stopani, N. Sergiyevsky and others) in Obolensky's apartment.

May 5. Governor of Pskov issues passport to Lenin for leaving the country.

The congress called for May 6 at Smolensk does not meet; Lenin does not go to Smolensk.

May 20. Lenin, together with Martov, arrives illegally in St. Petersburg.

May 21. Lenin is arrested in St. Petersburg; held for ten days.

May 31. Lenin freed from arrest.

June. After his release from prison, Lenin goes to his mother in Podolsk, near Moscow; continues negotiations there with a number of Social-Democrats regarding the support of the *Iskra.*

June 7. Lenin goes from Podolsk to Ufa, where Krupskaya has been living. Conferences with local Social-Democrats. After a stay in Ufa, Lenin returns to Podolsk.

July 16. Lenin leaves for Germany to attend to the publication of the *Iskra.*

First Half of August. Lenin arrives in Zurich; meets with Axelrod.

From Zurich Lenin goes to Geneva and settles with Potresov in the village of Vezenas, near Geneva. Meetings and discussions with Plekhanov.

In Geneva, Lenin meets a number of Social-Democrats (I. Bauman, J. Stewlov, etc.) in regard to their participation in the work of the *Iskra.*

August 11–15. Conference at Corsier (near Geneva) between Lenin, Potresov, Plekhanov, Axelrod and Zasulich, on the organisation and the programme of the *Iskra;* discussion of the editorial Declaration drafted by Lenin; the conference nearly ends in a break between the "Iskrovtsi" and the Emancipation of Labour group.

August 15. In the evening Lenin leaves for Nürnberg to call on Adolf Braun, German Social-Democrat, who gives considerable technical aid to the starting of the *Iskra* in Germany. From Nürnberg Lenin sends an important letter to X——, describing the relationship between the *Iskra* and the Emancipation of Labour group and the League of Russian Social-Democrats.

August 24. Lenin leaves Nürnberg for Munich. The editorial board of the *Iskra* established at Munich (Lenin, Potresov, Zasulich).

September or October. Meeting in Munich with K. Takhtarev, editor of *Rabochaya Mysl.* Lenin declines Takhtarev's suggestion that Plekhanov be invited to edit *Rabochaya Mysl.*

October. Preparations for first issue of the *Iskra.*

Publication of editorial Declaration of the *Iskra.*

November. Lenin writes preface to pamphlet *May Days in Kharkov* (published in January, 1901). Goes to Leipzig, where the *Iskra* is printed, to complete all work connected with the printing of the first issue.

December 11. First issue of the *Iskra* appears.

December 16. Preliminary conversations of Lenin, Potresov and Zasulich with Struve on conditions of collaboration on the "democratic opposition," as represented by Struve, with the *Iskra.*

1901

January. Axelrod and Plekhanov arrive in Munich. A number of editorial conferences take place. Conversations with Struve are continued.

January 17. At a conference between the editors of the *Iskra* and Struve the conditions proposed by the latter in regard to co-operation of the "democratic opposition" with the *Iskra* are adopted. Lenin disagrees with the majority, states his protest against the decision adopted, and writes to Plekhanov, who has already left Munich, to suggest that relations with Struve be broken. Plekhanov fails to support Lenin.

February 15. Lenin goes to Prague for a few days, via Vienna, in connection with the organisation of Krupskaya's trip to Germany.

March. Lenin negotiates with L. Goldman, whom he had invited from Russia to Munich, on the organisation of an illegal *Iskra* printing plant in Russia.

March 10. First issue of the *Zarya* appears (Date on cover, "April").

End of March. Martov arrives in Munich from Russia.

Middle of April. Krupskaya arrives in Munich from Russia.

April 12. In a letter to Axelrod, Lenin suggests a plan for the organisation of a League, which shall permit literary workers to be recruited, under the guidance of the *Iskra* editors from among Social-Democratic groups abroad.

Beginning of May. Plekhanov arrives in Munich. At a conference of the *Iskra* editors the plan of the second issue of the *Zarya* is drafted, and preliminary by-laws of the League are drawn up.

May. Lenin's article "Where To Begin" appears in *Iskra.* Lenin plans a pamphlet (*What Is To Be Done?*) that shall formulate the fundamental problems of revolutionary Social-Democracy in matters of organisation and tactics and shall present a systematic criticism of the policies of *Rabocheye Dyelo.* Lenin will only be able to proceed with this work in the fall.

May 12. Negotiations between Lenin and Ryazanov, member of the Borba group, on the calling, at the initiative of that group (Ryazanov, Steklov, Danevich-Gurevich), of a preliminary conference of the *Iskra-Zarya,* the group Social-Democrat and the League of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad. Conference held in June, at Geneva.

June 18. Lenin enquires by letter from V. Ketskhaveli, in Baku, as to the practicability of establishing a secret *Iskra* printing plant in that city.

End of June–Beginning of July. Lenin writes article "The Persecutors of the Zemstvo and the Hannibals of Liberalism," directed against Struve.

June 26. Lenin raises before the members of the editorial board the question of drafting the programme of the party. Toward the end of the year Plekhanov undertakes to draft the programme.

July. Disagreement among the editors of the *Iskra* over the tactics of revolutionary Social-Democracy in regard to bourgeois Liberalism as expounded in Lenin's article "Persecutors of the Zemstvo and the Hannibals of Liberalism." Correspondence exchanged on the matter between Lenin, Plekhanov and Axelrod.

End of Summer–Beginning of Fall. Lenin writes a series of articles entitled "The Agrarian Question and the 'Critics of Marx'," directed against Bulgakov, Chernov, Hertz, and other Revisionists.

Beginning of October. Lenin goes to Zurich to attend the "Unity" Congress.

October 3. At a conference of the *Iskra* group at Zurich, on the eve of the opening of the "Unity" Congress, the further relationship between the *Iskra* and the *Rabocheye Dyelo* groups is discussed; Lenin advocates a break; Plekhanov and Martov oppose it. Lenin is chosen to address the Congress in behalf of the *Iskra* group.

October 4. Lenin speaks at the "Unity" Congress.

October 5. Lenin, together with the whole *Iskra* group, quits the "Unity" Congress.

October. Lenin assumes a leading part in the organisation of the "Foreign League of Revolutionary Social-Democracy."

December. Nos. 2-3 of the *Zarya* appear, with Lenin's articles, "The Persecutors of the Zemstvo and the Hannibals of Liberalism" and "The Agrarian Question and the 'Critics of Marx'."

Lenin writes *What Is To Be Done?*

1902

January. The editors of the *Iskra* discuss the draft of party programme prepared by Plekhanov. Lenin criticises Plekhanov's draft.

THE END